DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 074 354 AC 014 298

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Hargis, Jerry L., Ed. |
| TITLE | Proceedings of a National Conference on The Continuing Education Unit: An Examination. (April 27-28, 1972). |
| INSTITUTION | Virginia Polytechnic Inst. and State Univ., Blacksburg. Extension Div. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Atlanta, Ga. Commission on Colleges. |
| PUB DATE | Apr 72 |
| NOTE | 213p. |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.65 HC-$9.87 |
| DESCRIPTORS | Adult Education; *Conference Reports; Data Collection; Extension Education; Information Retrieval; *University Extension |

ABSTRACT

Proceedings of a national conference on continuing education are presented. Subjects discussed include: (1) The National Task Force Report; Implications for Business and Industry; (2) The Public Service Challenge; Implications for University Continuing Education of the Continuing Education Unit (CEU); (3) Implications for Government training; (4) Recording and Retrieving CEU Data; (5) Criteria for a Handbook; and (6) General Information. (CK)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 074354

# THE CONTINUING EDUCATION UNIT

## AN EXAMINATION

## PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

## NATIONAL CONFERENCE

AC014 248

ED 074354

# PROCEEDINGS

OF

A NATIONAL CONFERENCE

ON

# THE CONTINUING EDUCATION UNIT - AN EXAMINATION

APRIL 27-28, 1972

EXTENSION DIVISION

DONALDSON BROWN CENTER FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

BLACKSBURG, VIRGINIA

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The Extension Division of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University gratefully acknowledges the co-sponsorship of this conference with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Appreciation is also extended to other organizations represented and contributing to this conference including The National Task Force on the Continuing Education Unit, The National University Extension Association, and The Division of Adult Programs - U.S. Office of Education.

# PREFACE

The brochure of announcement for this conference stated the purpose of the conference as follows:

> "After four years of work by the National Task Force on the Continuing Education Unit and with the recent revision of Standard Nine by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, the CEU has received increasing national attention.
>
> This conference proposes to provide an opportunity to examine the implications of the CEU from many viewpoints. It is expected that the conference may raise as many questions as it answers but it is felt that the time has come for the pulling together of national resources to discuss the CEU."

It might be noted that the intent was to examine the implications of the CEU. Much of the conference time was devoted to discussion of specific mechanical aspects of the CEU reporting and retrieving process. However, the insightful challenges issued by Dr. Ed Boone, Mr. Al Stem, and Colonel Gil Monti and other presenters are part of these proceedings.

In a conference of this type many individuals are due thanks for their efforts. The major organizations have been cited in the acknowledgments. It is fitting to list also the individuals in those organizations who provided support for the conference. From the Southern Association, Mr. Gordon Sweet and Dr. Grover Andrews. From the National Task Force, Dr. William Turner, Chairman, and Dr. Keith Glancy. From NUEA, Dr. Robert Pitchell. From the USOE, Mr. Paul Delker, and here at Virginia Tech the Dean of Extension, Dr. William E. Skelton.

Appreciation is expressed for the quality performance of staff of the Donaldson Brown Center for Continuing Education. Mr. Jerry Hargis, CEC Associate Director for Non-Credit Programs is to be commended for his good efforts in planning this conference. Additionally, we acknowledge by name the good support of Mr. Richard Foster, CEC Associate Director for Administration, Mr. Richard Harshberger, Associate Director for Off-Campus Credit Programs, Mr. Clark Jones, Mr. Ed Simpson, Mr. Art Rickborn, Mrs. Robyn Webb, Mrs. Laura Ruhsam, Mrs. Judy Reese, Mrs. Nancy Durrett, Mrs. Joanne Evans, Mrs. Johnna Coats, Mrs. Sherry Stevens, and Mrs. Bonnie Odell. Special thanks go to Mr. A. B. Lyon who taped the proceedings and video taped presentation. Mrs. Martha Boone and Mr. John Webber are commended for their usual high quality service in lodging and food service.

Dr. William L. Flowers, Jr.
Associate Dean and Director
Donaldson Brown Center for
Continuing Education
Virginia Polytechnic Institute
and State University

EXTENSION DIVISION

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

*Blacksburg, Virginia* 24061

OFFICE OF THE DEAN

To the Conference Participants:

The Extension Division of Virginia Tech, through the Donaldson Brown Continuing Education Center, is pleased to have been co-sponsor with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools in a conference on the Continuing Education Unit. The conference was attended by 171 interested people from 25 states.

The Extension Division planned publication of the proceedings on the CEU with support from the offices of the Division of Adult Programs, U. S. Office of Education. These proceedings are presented in this document for your information and use.

In addition to members of the Virginia Tech Staff who were involved, it is appropriate that we express appreciation to:

Dr. Grover Andrews, Associate Executive Secretary, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools;

Dr. Edward Boone, President-elect of AEA-USA;

Mr. Paul Delker, Director, Division of Adult Programs, U. S. Office of Education;

Dr. Robert Pitchell, Executive Director, National University Extension Association;

Mr. Gordon Sweet, Executive Secretary, Commission on Colleges, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools; and

Dr. William Turner, Chairman, National Task Force on CEU.

Sincerely,

W. E. Skelton

W. E. Skelton, Dean

aw

SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS
795 Peachtree Street · Atlanta, Georgia 30308
Phone 875-8011 Area Code 404

To the Conference Participants:

The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools is pleased to have jointly sponsored this conference on the Continuing Education Unit. In December of 1971 the College Delegate Assembly of the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools adopted a new standard for Special Activities (Extension, Adult and Continuing Education) which included The Continuing Education Unit.

The CEU is to be used by the college members of the Association as a means for recording the non-credit activities of an institution and as a record system for the individual student of his non-credit courses and programs.

The papers presented and discussion which followed at this conference will be used to assist the Commission in developing uniform guidelines and record keeping procedures for the college members of the Association. We anticipate having these materials in a finished form by early 1973.

We appreciate the work of the National Task Force of the National University Extension Association which developed the CEU, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, and program participants for making this conference possible and successful.

Sincerely,

Gordon W. Sweet

Gordon W. Sweet
Executive Secretary
Commission on Colleges

GWS:vd

These Proceedings

Edited By

Mr. Jerry L. Hargis

Associate Director
for
Non-Credit Programs

Donaldson Brown Center
for
Continuing Education

Virginia Polytechnic Institute
and State University

Blacksburg, Virginia

1972

DONALDSON BROWN CENTER FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION

Blacksburg, Virginia

THE CONTINUING EDUCATION UNIT-AN EXAMINATION
Conference Enrollment
Date: April 27-April 28, 1972
DONALDSON BROWN CENTER FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION

Dr. Harold J. Alford
Education Testing Service
Princeton, New Jersey

Walter E. Allan
Lake-Sumter Community College
P. O. Box 398
Howey-in-the-Mills, Fla. 32737

Hubert J. Ashe
Va. Highlands Community College
P. O. Box 828
Abingdon, Virginia 24210

Flora Lee Bain
University of Southern Mississippi
Southern Station, Box 95
Hattiesburg, Mississippi 39401

Steven L. Barber
Phys. Psych. Cont. Educ. Project
South Regional Education Board
Atlanta, Georgia 30313

Dr. William D. Barton
University of Tennessee
1501 Aldenwood Road
Knoxville, Tenn. 37919

David N. Bean
University of Tennessee
2413 Monterey Road
Knoxville, Tenn. 37912

Frank Bean
Kentucky State College
302 Glendover Road
Frankfort, Kentucky 40503

Dr. Thomas A. Benton
Our Lady of Holy Cross College
4123 Woodland Drive
New Orleans, La. 70114

William C. B. Berghaus
Lord Fairfax Community College
Box 81
Middletown, Virginia 22645

Dr. Richard C. Berne
Western Carolina University
Extension Division
P. O. Box 1677
Cullowhee, N.C. 28723

Sam C. Bills
University of Tennessee
924 Scenic Drive
Knoxville, Tenn. 37919

Eugene F. Bolick
Education Services Office
701 Kingston Drive
Virginia Beach, Virginia

Hilton T. Bonniwell
Georgia Southern College
32 Golf Club Circle
Statesboro, Georgia 30458

Dr. Edward Booth
University of Alabama
1162 Northwood Lake
Northport, Ala. 35486

Dr. Glen Bridges
Western Carolina University
Extension Services
P. O. Box 1677
Cullowhee, N.C. 28723

Dr. William Bridges
Tidewater Community College
4741 Red Coat Road
Virginia Beach, Virginia 23415

Richard Brightwell
Director, Continuing Education
University of South Florida
311 Druid Hills Road
Temple Terrace, Fla. 33617

Joseph D. Brindley
Snead State Junior College
Oneonta, Ala. 35121

W. A. Brotherton
Memphis State University
1680 Hayne Road
Memphis, Tenn. 38117

Bob Brown
Thomas Moore College
P. O. Box 85
Covington, Ky. 41017

Dr. J. Fred Burgess
Columbus College
Columbus, Georgia 37907

Tom Burleson
Va. Western Community College
Roanoke, Virginia

McDawson L. Burton
Tuskegee Institute
2103 Washington Street
Tuskegee Institute, Ala. 36088

Glenn L. Bushey
Univ. of Tenn. - Chattanooga
1013 Meadowlake Road
Chattanooga, Tenn. 37401

Ronald C. Butler
Florida International University
14631 Palmetto Palm Avenue
Miami Lakes, Fla. 33014

Phillip R. Campbell
Univ. of West Florida
40 Rockwood Road
Pensacola, Fla. 32504

James A. Chinn
Broward Community College
1141 N. W. 75 Terr.
Plantation, Fla.

Gary Cogley
University of Wisconsin
South Hall
Menomonie, Wisc. 54751

Dr. William J. Cook, Jr.
Auburn Univ. at Montgomery
1375 Pine Ridge
Montgomery, Ala. 36109

Donald D. Craft
Wytheville Community College
825 North 3rd Street
Wytheville, Virginia 24382

Marcus K. Davis
Pennsylvania State Univ.
1665 Cherry Hill Road
State College, Pa. 16801

Leonard C. Douglas
University of Missouri Extension
3 Mumford Drive
Columbia, Missouri 66201

Gordon L. Dowell
Studies & Training Specialist
I.A.E.S.
College Station, Texas 77843

Richard A. Dunsing
University of Richmond
Richmond, Virginia

Mrs. A. C. Epps
Virginia Commonwealth University
6323 Ridgeway Road
Richmond, Virginia 23226

Lewis Everette, Jr.
P. O. Drawer 1878
Goldsboro, N.C. 27530

Carl Fisher
1303-A Grove Avenue
Richmond, Virginia

Mr. William R. Foley
147 Winston Drive
Williamsburg, Virginia 23185

Dr. David E. Fox
1155 Westmoreland Drive
Harrisonburg, Virginia 22801

Virgil D. Gerring
2514 Willow Drive
Fargo, North Dakota 58102

Quentin H. Gessner
412 Maynard Street
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

Keith E. Glancy
13000 Old Columbia Pike
Silver Spring, Maryland 20904

Max R. Glass
205 Audubon Drive
Danville, Virginia 24541

Marion G. Goodpasture, Jr.
Ferrum
Virginia 24088

Kurt Gottschalls
600 Branden Avenue, Apt. 1
Charlottesville, Va. 22903

Robert D. Graham, Jr.
110 Oakwood Drive
Hopewell, Virginia 23860

Richard N. Greene
Route 2 Box 126
Morganton, N.C. 28655

Dr. Betty Guiliani
1322 Oakridge #208
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

R. J. Guinn
Charlottesville
Virginia

Betty H. Gwaltney
Medical College of Virginia
Richmond, Virginia 23219

R. O. Hansen
25 Ridgewood Parkway
Newport News, Virginia

Mrs. Alma Lee Haragan
713 Greenridge Lane
Louisville, Kentucky 40207

Mrs. Ruth J. Harris
2121 Ruffin Street
Durham, N.C. 27704

Dean Minor Hawk
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Penn. 15213

Ruith I. Heinemann
835 South Wolcott
Chicago, Ill. 60612

William H. Heriford
Route 1 Box 72
Hurdle Mills, N.C. 27541

Dr. D. J. Herrmann
206 Matoaka Court
Williamsburg, Virginia 23185

Carl W. Holland
210 Plantation Road, Route 5
Bristol, Virginia 24201

Dr. William A. Hoppe
6266 Parkbrook Drive
Mobile, Ala. 36608

Bruce I. Howell
3012 Englewood Drive
Kinston, North Carolina 28501

Stephen S. Janes
Box 168
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

R. D. Johnson
Spindletop Hall, Route 6
Lexington, Kentucky 40505

Charles O. Jones
1914 Nannette Drive
Tallahassee, Fla. 32303

J. W. Kandzer
999 Avenue H., N.E.
Winter Haven, Fla. 33880

Mr. John B. King
4800 Aspen Avenue
Memphis, Tennessee 38128

G. Steward Kirby
Box 600
Lenoir, North Carolina 28614

Dr. Gerald L. Knutson
1103 North Lincoln
Stillwater, Okalhoma 74074

R. W. Long
659 Highland Park Drive
Eden, N.C. 27288

Dr. R. A. Mabry
5206 Rembert Drive
Raleigh, N.C. 27609

John A. Mapp
116 Matoaka Road
Richmond, Virginia 23226

Wayne S. Martin
1019 La Rue
Reno, Nevada 89507

Jim Maxey
Box 168
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

Arthur W. McDaniel
38 Bobby Drive, Robscott Manor
Newark, Dela.

D. M. McElroy
4513 18th Street
Lubbach, Texas

Joseph P. Mcquinn
University of Rhode Island
5 Sauga Drive
North Kinston, R.I.

Claudia M. McLean
Caldwell Community College
Route 2 Box 586-A
Hudson, N.C. 28638

Barry L. Mellinger
Southern Assoc. of Colleges
and Schools
3672 Glen Mora Drive
Decatur, Georgia 30032

Mrs. Mary E. Miller
Southern Methodist University
School of Continuing Education
Dallas, Texas 75222

Robert L. Mitchell
University of North Florida
2323 Courtney Drive
Jacksonville, Fla. 32208

Joseph W. Morris
Tennessee State University
119 Harpeth Valley Road
Nashville, Tenn. 37321

Mrs. Carmita A. Murphy
University of New Hampshire
Division of Continuing Education
Durham, New Hampshire 03824

Wallace K. Nave
Western Kentucky University
1217 Apache Way
Bowling Green, Ky. 42101

Dr. Ronald A. Newell
Florida International University
15223 S. W. 81 Avenue
Miami, Fla. 33157

Albert C. Noble
East Tennessee State University
156 Indian Trail
Bristol, Tenn. 37620

Travis J. Northcutt, Jr.
Florida Board of Regents
1118 Circle Drive
Tallahassee, Fla. 32303

John Van Osdale
University of Wisconsin
Route 2
Menomonie, Wisconsin 54751

Herb E. Oversield
University of Texas
6704 Dubuque La.
Austin, Texas

Mary Agnes Passafiume
Spalding College
1037 Everett Avenue, Apt. 26
Louisville, Ky. 40204

Sherman L. Pease
University of Houston
925 Caroline
Houston, Texas 77002

Dr. L. O. Pellegrin
Louisianna State University
Division of Continuing Education
Baton Rouge, La. 70803

J. I. Pennington
University of North Dakota
2404 Belmont Road
Grand Forks, North Dakota 58201

J. Coulson Phillips
Blue Ridge Community College
1009 Ridgemont Drive
Staunton, Virginia 24401

Louis E. Phillips
Georgia Center for Continuing Education
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30601

Theo. James Pinnock
Tuskegee Institute
Drawer SS
Tuskegee Institute, Ala. 36088

John Powell
Division of Continuing Education
Louisianna State University
Baton Rouge, La. 70803

O. E. Price
East Tennessee State University
134 Princeton Road
Johnson City, Tenn.

Dr. Donald E. Puyear
Va. Highlands Community College
P. O. Box 828
Abingdon, Virginia 24210

Richard A. Ridge
Germanna Community College
1028 Conway Road
Fredericksburg, Va. 22401

Allen Rodeheffer
Board of Higher Education
1307 Glenwood Avenue
Raleigh, North Carolina

Larry G. Romig
University of South Florida
6029 18th Avenue North
St. Petersburg, Fla. 33710

Mr. Joseph J. Semrow
North Central Association
5454 South Shore Drive
Shoreland Hotel
Chicago, Illinois 60615

Norman W. Schul
Univ. of North Carolina - Charlotte
3531 Donovan Place
Charlotte, North Carolina 28215

Roscoe B. Shain, Jr.
Nashville State Tech. Inst.
2101 Hillsboro Road, Apt. P-3
Nashville, Tenn. 37212

Sid Smith
Dabney Lancaster Community College
P. O. Box 318
Clifton Forge, Va. 24422

Dan Stallings
Caldwell Community College
Box 600
Lenoir, North Carolina 28614

Maurice Strausbaugh
Virginia Western Community College
P. O. Box 4195, 3095 Colonial Ave.
Roanoke, Va. 24015

Gordon W. Sweet
S. Assoc. of Colleges & Schools
4985 Lake Forest Dr., N.W.
Decatur, Ga. 30032

Gordon P. Thomas
Central Virginia Community College
Box 66
Madison Heights, Va. 24572

Hilda E. Tinney
1343 Pedrick Road
Tallahassee, Fla. 32301

Mrs. Donald H. Turner
East Texas State University
P. O. Box 3441 ET Station
Commerce, Texas 75428

Madison E. Weidner
Rutgers Univ. Extension Div.
77 Hamilton Street
New Brunswick, N.J. 08903

W. F. Whitbeck
Old Dominion University
1470 Sweetbriar Avenue
Norfolk, Va. 23509

John A. Wilkins
University of Michigan
Extension Division
412 Maynard Street
Ann Arbor, Mich. 48104

John W. Williams
G.E.D. Director
204 Captain Newport Circle
Williamsburg, Va. 23185

Dr. Sam M. Willis
Clemson University
116 East Brookwood Drive
P. O. Box 63
Clemson, South Carolina 29631

Mrs. Dinah Wolfe
Va. Commonwealth University
118 Seneca Road
Richmond, Virginia 23226

Lawrence B. Wood, Jr.
Christopher Newport College
2305 Chesapeake Ave.
Hampton, Virginia 23361

George E. Young
University of Houston
925 Caroline
Houston, Texas 77002

CONTENTS


| | | |
|---|---|---|
| SESSION I | Welcome and Introduction | 1 |
| | A Look at Standard Nine<br>Mr. Gordon W. Sweet, Executive Director, Commission on Colleges, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools | 4 |
| | The National Task Force Report<br>Dr. William L. Turner, Secretary, Department of Administration, State of North Carolina | 15 |
| | Implications for Business and Industry<br>Mr. Carl Tripp, Manager of Marketing Personnel Development, Union Carbide Corporation | 23 |
| BANQUET | Remarks | |
| | Mr. Paul Delker, Director, Division of Adult Programs, United States Office of Education | 38 |
| | Dr. Leslie M. Malpass, Vice-President for Academic Affairs, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University | 43 |
| SYMPOSIUM I | The Public Service Challenge<br>Dr. Edward J. Boone, Assistant Director and Head, Department of Adult and Community College Education | 47 |
| | Implications for University Continuing Education of the CEU<br>Dean Andre de Porry, School of Continuing Education, University of Virginia | 58 |
| SYMPOSIUM II | Implications for Government Training<br>Dr. William L. Flowers, Associate Dean and Director, Donaldson Brown Center for Continuing Education, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University | 73 |
| | Mr. Albert F. Stem, Jr., State Division of Personnel, Commonwealth of Virginia<br>Colonel Gilbert A. Monti, Division of State Planning and Community Affairs, Commonwealth of Virginia | 79 |
| SESSION II | Recording and Retrieving CEU Data<br>Dr. G. E. Lorey, Dean of Extension and Continuing Education, University of Missouri, Rolla | 95 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| SESSION III | Criteria for a Handbook<br>Dr. R. J. Pitchell, Executive Director, National University Extension Association | 108 |
| SESSION IV | Discussion Panel<br>Dr. Grover J. Andrews, Administrative Assistant to the Director, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools | 115 |
| APPENDIX A | General Information on CEU | |
| APPENDIX B | Questions and Answers Booklet on CEU | |
| APPENDIX | A Working Paper on Use of the CEU within a University System | |

Session I

CHAIRMAN, DR. WILLIAM L. FLOWERS, ASSOCIATE DEAN, VIRGINIA TECH

Here at Virginia Tech we are deeply concerned and involved in program conferences such as you are concerned about. During the course of the first part of this year, we were host to 12,500 people who came to and were served by this conference center. That was the light quarter of the year. In 1972 we have approximately 200 conferences booked, and we anticipate we will be serving somewhere in the neighborhood of 40-50,000 people through the Center during this year. One of the persons who is behind that is our Dean who began about 20 years ago to conceive of this idea of a Continuing Education Center - its facilities less than five years old. He saw for that dream come true and many of the ladies that you saw here today helped and assisted him in the early development of that concept from a financial point of view. I'd like to introduce to you the Dean of Extension for Virginia Tech under whose direction all Extension and the Continuing Education Center come -- Dean Bill Skelton.

DEAN WILLIAM SKELTON, VIRGINIA TECH

Thank you very much Dr. Flowers. For those of you that have not had a chance to meet him, Dean Flowers is responsible in our Extension Division for the Adult Education Center here and for off-campus graduate programs throughout the State.

It is also my pleasure to welcome you to Virginia Tech and the Donaldson Brown Center for Continuing Education. We feel this conference to be an important national event, discussing what is surely going to become an important national factor in continuing education - the Continuing Education Unit. As the land-grant institution for the State of Virginia, Virginia Tech through its extension activities has for many years provided counseling, expertise, and scientific know-how in the solution of problems for our state's citizens.

We find, however, in the last few years that Virginia's character like our national character is rapidly changing. Industries other than agriculture have evolved throughout our state and the problems of urbanization, transportation, and man's need to continue to learn an increasing variety of subjects have made new demands upon extension programs here at Virginia Tech.

To meet the problems and demands of these new and expanding areas, extension work has taken on new and expanding forms. These new forms were embodied in the establishment of the Extension Division some five years ago.

When our division was formed we had at the outset a happy marriage between Cooperative Extension and what nationally has been called General Extension. Our Comprehensive Extension Division had from the beginning a curious hybrid vigor, and it is now much more accurate to think of extension in this state as an extension of the total University's resources to the people of this state for the solution of their problems.

The adult education capacity to help adults in problem solving processes is more in demand than ever before. The very essence of our existence as a nation is the ability to educate people to continue to learn. We must furnish, through education as a backdrop for problem solving, appropriate and useful concepts which lead the individual to an understanding of the forces of society as they relate to his individual roles in that society. For this reason we here at Virginia Tech have developed a total University approach to the problems of our state's citizens. We anticipate with the advent of the Continuing Education Unit we will extend our service capacity to these adults, yet another step.

The extension program here at Tech has grown because it has always been people-oriented. The scope of our work is the scope of adult need. We see ourselves as a comprehensive service to the people of Virginia. It was this tradition of service which helped provide this Conference Center. We were conducting non-credit conferences, institutes, and workshops here at Virginia Tech long before this building came into existence. And the identified need on the part of the people of Virginia for an adult center led to a spontaneous outpouring of private contributions and citizen's advocacy in the state legislature which led to the eventual construction of this building.

We here at Tech feel that extension should be more than just a repeating of the things done on a university campus off the university campus. True extension begins when we move beyond the University's traditional programs with specialized programming designed to meet the problems of the world of the adult.

This service orientation of Virginia Tech to the adult citizen of our state is another reason why we welcome the advent of the Continuing Education Unit. Here, indeed, is a convenient easy to understand method whereby the busy adult can keep track of his non-credit learning activities.

When we began planning for this conference some six to nine months ago, we realized that it may well raise as many questions as it answers, but we feel this too is healthy for through this spirit of inquiry and sharing of our experiences we will develop the realizations and sensitivities necessary for us to understand the complex issues with which we deal.

It is appropriate that we begin with a word of thanks to those individuals who made this program possible. To Gordon Sweet, Grover Andrews and their staff at the Southern Association, to Dr. Bill Turner and the National Task Force on the Continuing Education Unit, to Mr. Paul Delker and his staff at the Office of Education in Washington, to Dr. Bob Pitchell at NUEA, and all those other individuals who have worked so hard to make this program possible, we say at the outset - thank you.

So, if you folks have a good conference during the next day and a half, offer your thanks to those individuals I have named. If you don't have a good conference, you come and see me.

Again, we offer you welcome. We are happy to have you at Virginia Tech. We hope this learning experience provides you with the information you need concerning the Continuing Education Unit.

Before I leave the podium, it is my pleasure and opportunity to introduce to you the person who will help us take a look at Standard IX. I think it is particularly appropriate that he be here and very considerate of Mr. Gordon Sweet to work us into his very busy schedule. A lot of you know Gordon on a first name basis, but some of you may not have had this pleasure and opportunity. Mr. Sweet is the Executive Secretary of the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. This is an accrediting agency for elementary, secondary schools and institutions of higher learning in eleven southeastern states. He has been the Executive Secretary since 1958. Mr. Sweet joined the Association after serving from 1949 to 1958 as Dean of the College, Queens College, in Charlotte, North Carolina. He became affiliated with Queens College in 1940 after two years on the faculty at the University of Michigan. As Executive Secretary of the Commission on Colleges, Mr. Sweet coordinates activities of the Central Office in Atlanta and serves as consultant to the member colleges and universities and particularly those seeking accreditation. He holds a B.S. Degree from the Eastern Michigan University, the Masters from the University of the Americas and the Florida Institute of Technology. So with this background and a professional career devoted to education, I feel that we are very, very fortunate in having him to discuss with us at this time "A Look at Standard IX."

MR. GORDON SWEET , SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS

The chairman is right. I feel that I don't need any introduction for most of you people. There are only a few here that I don't know personally, but not many, and while I, of course would say that I appreciate the opportunity of being here, what is more important I suppose for me to say is that we appreciate your coming here. You can help us develop even more, something which we already have in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. We expect, particularly after this meeting, the CEU will spread into the other regional associations and become a recognized national standard. In relation to my remarks today, I want to express appreciation to members of my staff who assisted me in preparing this statement. In other words, I didn't write this whole speech all by myself.

First of all, I would like to say something about our Association. It is a very old organization dating back to 1895 along with the North Central Association - the oldest of the six regional associations in the United States. These in the United States are the only voluntary non-governmental organizations having to do with the regulation of colleges that exist in the world.

The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools is concerned with the improvement of educational institutions and the maintenance of at least minimum standards of quality through accreditation. The Association is composed of four Commissions which provide institutional accreditation for all levels of education in this region (1) elementary schools, (2) secondary schools, (3) post-secondary, non-collegiate occupational institutions, and (4) colleges and universities.

The Commission on Colleges is the arm of the Association which accredits collegiate institutions. The membership of the Commission (accredited colleges and universities) presently numbers 603. This membership represents a broad variety of types of institutions including two-year liberal arts junior colleges, two-year comprehensive community colleges, two-year degree-granting technical institutes, four-year liberal arts colleges, complex public and private universities, professional schools of medicine, theological seminaries, schools of performing and creative arts, a school of optometry and even a school of mortuary science. From this description of the membership, the diversified responsibilities and the attendant diversified activities of the Commission on Colleges are apparent.

Accreditation activities incorporate three major processes common to all types of institutions. These are (1) institutional self-study, (2) on-site peer evaluation of institutions, and (3) voluntary participation of representatives of member institutions. In effect, voluntary institutional accreditation is a process whereby institutions of higher education provide a means of self-regulated quality control.

One important aspect of this process is that of establishing and maintaining standards of quality which provide a basis both for the accreditation process and guidelines which institutions may utilize in their own self-improvement. While the term "standards" is used here, the connotation is different from that commonly used. Accreditation standards, here referring to the Standards of the College Delegate Assembly, are not specific quantitative indicators of quality which are readily and precisely measurable. Rather the standards represent, for the most part, statements of principle which have proven to be sound practices for educational institutions over a long period of time.

The current edition of the Standards of the College Delegate Assembly reflect this philosophy. Prior to 1962, the standards were very quantitative in nature, and therefore, quite prescriptive and consequently restrictive to institutions attempting to depart from tradition by trying new techniques and developing new programs. In 1962, following much study and deliberation, a new set of Standards was adopted by the College Delegate Assembly which was largely qualitative in nature and in form very similar to the 1971 edition currently in use. Since 1962, however, extensive revisions of the Standards have been made in an attempt to adapt them to rapidly changing practices in higher education in this region. These revisions have included; a complete revision of illustration 4 of Standard IV (Educational Expenditures); extensive revision and additions of all illustrations pertaining to vocational-technical education; Illustration 3 of Standard V (Academic Preparation of Faculty); and most recently a complete revision of Standard IX (Special Activities) which is a primary concern of this conference.

For many years, the Commission on Colleges has attempted to provide a positive influence upon those areas commonly classified as special activities--nontraditional study areas usually created in response to a public need. Many and rapid changes have taken place within institutions in the broad area of special activities during the past several years. The addition of off-campus programs in centers and branches (including military bases) the rapid development of multi-campus systems of colleges, a phenomenal increase in non-credit and credit continuing education programs, extensive development of programs of instruction utilizing television, radio, computers, telewriters, tele-lecture and other forms of media, foreign travel and study, independent study and external and special non-traditional study programs all provide examples of dramatic changes in higher education during recent years. To some extent, all types of institutions are engaged in some of these special activities. Very recently, I visited a very small graduate level theological seminary where rather extensive programs of continuing education are offered. Non-credit courses for parish priests and ministers have become an important facet of that institution's program. Universities, comprehensive community colleges and two-year technical institutes typically provide large and diversified continuing and adult education programs. In many cases student enrollment in these offerings are greater than that for regular credit programs.

The Commission on Colleges has attempted to keep pace with these changes by developing standards and procedures consistent with these new programs. The revision of Standard IX adopted at the last annual meeting of the Association represents the result of extensive experience and an in-depth study of the types of activities described above. Many of you were involved in one way or another in this study. While the new standard reflects what many institutions have been doing in the area of special activities, it is perhaps ahead of most institutions. As a rule it is our belief that the "Standards" should closely follow what is taking place within member institutions and not necessarily lead or provide new horizons of institutional practice. In my experience, however, the new standard on Special Activities is probably the most advanced standard relative to practices of member institutions, which has been developed. It includes many challenges for member colleges and encourages institutions to develop new programs to meet the rapidly changing educational needs of their constituents.

A major change in the new standard pertains to the incorporation of the continuing education unit (CEU) as a means of identifying and recording non-credit offerings of member institutions. While the CEU is not an invention of the Commission on Colleges, its development by the National Task Force has been followed very closely by the Commission. As early as 1968, the Commission on Colleges directed the staff of the Commission to develop a procedure for calculating the total full-time equivalent enrollment of institutions to include non-credit offerings. This project was begun and during the course of this study the work of the National Task Force was brought to our attention. Since the Task Force was concerned with the development of "a uniform unit of measurement for non-credit continuing education programs", the implications of the "unit" for the Commission's needs were evident. Therefore, the Commission delayed its study pending the outcome of the work of the Task Force. We are now in the process of developing a procedure for calculation of the total full-time equivalent enrollment of institutions, utilizing CEU for enrollment in non-credit programs. The College Commission has conducted two surveys of non-credit enrollment in member institutions. In the fall of 1971, a report form on non-credit enrollment was mailed to the chief executive officer of member institutions. This form was mailed at the request of the Executive Council of the Commission on Colleges in order to familiarize the officers in member institutions with the use of the continuing education unit (CEU) in calculating non-credit enrollment.

For the purposes of study, the Executive Council requested that non-credit enrollment initially be calculated on the basis of one equivalent-full-time non-credit hour being equal to one-half of one equivalent-full time credit hour. Institutions were asked to calculate the total number of contact hours in all non-credit courses offered during the 1970-71 academic year, and multiply this figure by the total number of students enrolled in each course. To arrive at equivalent-full-time

non-credit enrollment, the staff of the Commission on Colleges divided this figure by 860 (or twice the weight of an annual equivalent-full-time credit hour load) in order to arrive at a figure which is one-half the value of an equivalent-full-time credit load.

Many institutions calculated incorrectly the gross number of student contact hours in non-credit courses. Instead of multiplying the number of contact hours by the number of students for each non-credit course and then summing these totals, many institutions merely multiplied the gross hours by the gross number of students. Thus, the contact hours reported, in many cases, were higher than they should have been. However, the first survey of non-credit enrollment did provide some useful information as to the numbers and types of member institutions which offer non-credit enrollment.

Doctoral degree-granting universities most commonly reported to the Commission that non-credit enrollment could not be accurately calculated in their institutions, because of unavailable records, misrepresentative data, or confusion in record-keeping. Ironically, these institutions were the vanguards in offering non-credit courses during the last few decades.

Community and junior colleges, which have been engaged in non-credit education for a relatively shorter period of time have, in many cases, been able to report non-credit enrollment more accurately. State departments for community colleges may have been instrumental in requiring accurate record-keeping. This spring a second survey of non-credit enrollment is being conducted. Because of inaccuracies in reporting non-credit enrollment in the first survey, a revised form for reporting non-credit enrollment was mailed to a small sample of member institutions (N=75), which had previously reported inaccurate or misleading data. To date, the results of this second survey seem to indicate a better understanding of the CEU and this method of reporting and calculating non-credit FTE's.

Concurrently, of course, a complete revision of Standard IX was accomplished which included CEU as the means of recording participation in non-credit programs.

The primary purpose of this conference is to examine the implications of the CEU. I will not attempt to discuss here all of the detailed implications of the CEU. The rest of the program is concerned with this and provides for extensive discussion by those much better qualified than myself. However, I will try to pose several questions which I hope will be discussed in more detail during the sessions which follow.

1. What is the CEU and how is it defined? While the CEU is defined as "ten contact hours of participation...", it does not necessarily follow that a CEU must be awarded for each 10 hours a student participates in a non-credit course. For individual courses what criterion will be used to determine the amount of CEUs which will be granted? While this question must be

answered in advance of the course, who will make this determination and what criterion will be used? This, of course, should be an institutional decision but should be based on some sound rationale.

2. What is the relationship between CEU enrollments and credit enrollment in regular offerings in terms of the total institutional enrollment? Is enrollment in non-credit programs equivalent to enrollment in credit programs in terms of contact hours? For example, if a full-time student in credit work spends approximately 432 contact hours in class for an academic year, what would be a comparable number of contact hours which would be spent in order to develop a full-time equivalent enrollment in non-credit courses? We are certainly interested in your ideas along these lines.

3. How will the CEU be implemented by institutions which offer non-credit programs? What are the implications for:

    a) administration;
    b) record-keeping;
    c) reporting;
    d) information required of students;
    e) methods of evaluation and grading;
    f) evaluation of "on-the-job" training and work experience; and
    g) the combining of credit-courses and CEU's to meet graduation requirements.

4. What are the implications for systems of institutions? Will separate and perhaps different procedures be used for institutions within a system, or will a common procedure be followed? Within a system, what procedure will be used to develop a system-wide policy on the use of CEU---such as the approach the University System of Georgia has used and will be presented to you tomorrow?

5. What kinds of educational experiences will be recorded by CEU? For example, would CEU's be awarded for the occasional music recital on campus for students, or the campus guest speaker (or perhaps listening to music on the juke-box in the student center)? This again, presupposes the need for clear criteria for determining if and how many CEU's will be awarded for a given activity.

6. What criterion will be used for determination of faculty loads and faculty pay in non-credit programs?

I have attempted to provide "a look at Standard IX" as a basis for the discussion to follow. I have also tried to raise a few basic questions which should be discussed in this conference. While Standard IX does require institutions to use the CEU in recording non-credit programs, it does not (by intent) provide answers to specific questions pertaining to implementation. This is, of course, as it should be, as situations vary greatly among institutions. We are hopeful, however, that this conference will assist each of you in developing specific policies and procedures which will fit best the program of your institution. We hope that one outcome of this conference will be the development of a handbook or guidelines which would suggest a number of alternative approaches to these and other specific questions relating to the use of the CEU.

Thank you

Discussion Period

ANDRE DE PORRY, UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

Gordon, the development of Standard IX implies some very profound change for the system of higher education and the members of the Southern Association. A change for the special activities unit and even more a change for the institution itself in the way it is going to provide for the CEU to be able to go on and implement this standard. I am wondering in implementing and applying it if the Southern Association is going to wait on the periodic reviews of accreditation or is going to use some other device in order to try to determine the extent to which institutions are really coming to grips with the new way of looking at special activities in relation to Standard IX before periodic review time might come.

GORDON SWEET, SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS

Periodic review will be the primary way of determining this and, of course, as I pointed out earlier, I am a little bit concerned about institutions wanting to jump into this just to get in on the act immediately. I would remind you though, that we do have an Interim Report from each of our institutions, the five-year report as they call it. It would be in that 5th-year report that we would expect institutions to describe what they have done in the CEU since the last periodic review. I wish that state institutions in the state would cooperate. They won't. You can't get institutions in the state to cooperate. I wish they could cooperate in some way in deciding upon responsibilities in non-traditional studies. I was talking with a group today that suggested how fun it might be, how interesting it might be, if one state institution in a state is designated as the school to offer certain non-traditional studies, non-traditional programs, rather than for all of the institutions to try to do it. Let one institution be something like the Open University or the University Without Walls, because then we could get control of the situation. It is going to be very difficult to control all non-credit activities. It has become such a fad. Practically every program in higher education this year has had to do with off-campus non-traditional studies

BETTY H. GWALTNEY, MEDICAL COLLEGE OF VIRGINIA, RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

I'm here representing the American Nursing Association. However, I'm from the Medical College of Virginia in Richmond. I think that another way of looking at what Andre de Porry was just questioning is this, Andre. We are going to get a lot of push from the consumers. Our constituent association represents about 700-800,000 nurses in this country. Our Commission on Nursing Education, which is one of the units of the Association, has gone on record as recommending the Association adopt the Continuing Education Unit as one method of recording of non-credit continuing education for nurses. The reason and rationale behind this is the push coming from

the outside. Professions are facing the possibility, and very rapidly, of required credentialing, some kind of continuing education for relicensure. This is not only in nursing. It is in medicine, pharmacy, dentistry and the rest. You may have other examples. Now what I am saying is that as of next week when our bi-annual convention meets in Detroit, there will be some decisions made about the Association's stand. I am here representing the Association and I would like to hear from a lot of people on the subject Andre mentioned so that we do not move too fast in trying to provide for our constituents.

GORDON SWEET, SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS

I take that as a comment, not a question and I think you're right. Even where you are expected perhaps to give certain license or credentialing based on experience, if you can find a way to award CEU for certain kinds of experiences, this may be the best controlling factor that we will have, and the best use of it.

GORDON L. DOWELL, I.A.E.S., COLLEGE STATION, TEXAS

We're in the process of forming a new College of Continuing Education at Texas A & M University at the present time. My question relates to the matter of converting CE Units (Continuing Education Units) to full-time equivalent students. This has implications, of course, to us in terms of allocation of funds from the legislature. At the present time there is no provision or formula for doing this in Texas, and I believe I understood you to say a moment ago that perhaps this would be a decision that the Association would make. When do you envision that we might have some guidelines for converting CEUs to full-time equivalence in order that we could work this into a formula?

GORDON SWEET, SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS

By the end of this year.

DON HERRMANN, WILLIAM AND MARY COLLEGE, WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA

Gordon, is there a time set where by which each institution shall have a plan worked out and ready to present in connection with the CEU? For example, institutions that are coming up for evaluation in the next year or so. Are they supposed to have a plan worked out by the time the visiting committee gets there, or is this some time in the future, or what sort of time frame do you envision?

GORDON SWEET, SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS

I can't answer your question until I see a little more that develops out of this conference in the nature of guidelines. We need help too. If we can get some good guidelines and good policies established through

the work of your people, we hope, then we can begin telling the institution what we want them to report and what they need not report and so on. I think we could do it. We could put the staff on it and say, "1, 2, 3, 4, 5 -- this is it." We do not like to work that way.

DEAN G. E. LOREY, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI, ROLLA

I was very interested in your rationale or thoughts behind this two to one ratio I think I heard you say about the non-credit hour versus credit hour. The state university has been using full time student equivalents and we have not at all gone in that direction. As a matter of fact, we have gone the other way. I am lending a little support to what you were saying, that the part-time student we all recognize requires more effort on the part of the university it serves and this, in turn, is money. Now what we are doing in Missouri is following the formula that the Commission on Higher Education uses within the state for part-time students relative to credit. Then we convert the number of student-teacher hours for a credit course into the non-credit. It is a one to one ratio. The part-time student actually is given a little bit higher weight in student full-time equivalence than the on-campus full-time resident student. So I am very interested in your comments on this because right now for example North Central Association is accrediting our four campuses.

RUITH HEINEMANN, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

The remark that this gentleman just made prompts me to ask you, Gordon, if there is a difference between part-time student's work, credit earning, this sort of thing, and the purpose of CEUs for non-credit course work. Can you give any definitions so that this might be clarified?

GORDON SWEET, SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS

I am not sure if I understand all of this myself. It seems to me that practically all CEUs will be going to part-time students. We are talking about hours. In credit work we do have in our organization for credit students, for part-time and full-time a definite formula we follow. But that to me does not have anything to do with the CEUs. We ask that institutions total number of credit hours taken by part-time students and divide by 12. The same some states do and the federal government does, and then we arrive at our full-time student; but I am not in my mind relating this at all with the CEUs and CEU procedure, or have I misunderstood the question?

DR. KEITH GLANCY, JOHN HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

I would like to second Dean Lorey's comment relative to the number of hours that make up a full-time equivalent unit. The administration of non-credit work, I think, is more difficult for the amount of education that is involved than it is for standard credit. If you put on a two to one ratio you are putting an evaluation on non-credit work relative to credit

work and relative to the credit involved and not relative to the administration and the operation involved. The CEU was developed not to be transferred into credit, but we cannot stop this from being done; but it will not be done universally. It will be done in specific instances and I think no evaluation of a two to one or two to a half to one or one and a half to one should be set on it which would imply that it should be accepted for credit on that basis. Acceptance for credit will have to be done by the specific institution based on the specific program that is being evaluated, and it may be that they will accept it on a one to one. They may accept it on a two to one, but that is their decision and should not, and I do not think can be a flat rule.

GORDON SWEET, SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS

I believe my personal feeling would be that we should not try to translate the CEU into credit. I think when I said that, for example, CEUs might be considered in requirement for graduation, but I do not think we ought to try to put the two together.

Thank you very much. I have enjoyed being here with you. All the rest of your questions will be answered by the other leaders of the conference. Thank you very much.

DR. W. L. FLOWERS, VIRGINIA TECH

Thank you, Mr. Sweet. I think the value of this conference is going to be the interaction that you have one with another; the raising of questions with each of the resources available as you have already begun to do.

I saw that the Governor of North Carolina let Dr. Bill Turner come, and we will be hearing from him shortly after the coffee break.

INTRODUCTION OF DR. BILL TURNER BY DR. W. L. FLOWERS

An idea must always begin somewhere with someone and an idea must have someone to push it and leadership to go with it if it is going to come into its own.

The gentleman who is going to address us next has been involved in this idea work and creative work for some years. Dr. Bill Turner more recently has been serving as the head of the Governor's Division of Administration in North Carolina and prior to that he was Administrative Dean of North Carolina State University and gave much leadership to the growth of the Continuing Education Division and Extension Service at that institution. He was recognized and has been cited and listed in Who's Who in the South and Southeast. He is a gentleman who has also been cited as being among the American Men in Science. He received his Master's Degree and his B.S. Degree in Agricultural Economics at North Carolina State University. After that he earned a Doctorate Degree in Administration at Harvard University.

Dr. Turner has had such interests as being the prime mover in the North Carolina Housing Cooperation, a unique funding concept in the nation. He has been involved in the Southern Conference of Federal State's Relations Coordinators, and has served on the Boards of Director of many, many organizations.

He has served as an advisor to the Council of Higher Education and, in general, has given this leadership service to many facets of education in North Carolina and throughout the South. He served as Chairman of the National Task Force for the CEU -- the group composed not of educational personnel alone but of industry and business representatives as well. He has worked since about 1968, I believe, to bring into reality some of the ideas and concepts we have before us today. Without further ado, I present to you Dr. Bill Turner, Executive Secretary for Administration, and strong right arm of North Carolina's Governor Scott.

DR. BILL TURNER

Thank you Bill. You're very kind. I was wanting to tease Bill Flowers just a little bit. You know, he was originally at North Carolina State University in Raleigh. It was 34° in Raleigh last night -- an all time low. Bill, I didn't leave Raleigh until 10 o'clock this morning, and I was really expecting snow here in Blacksburg. How far did you miss it? We also ought to give Bill Flowers and his associates, Jerry Hargis and Clark Jones a real hand. You've done a real great job in Virginia Tech territory and in the State of Virginia the last year.

Ladies and Gentlemen, it is a pleasure for me to be with you this afternoon. I think they were sweating me out just a little bit. I saw Jerry Hargis back there at the door, looking out the door, about the time I opened the front of the door to come in the building, and that was about thirty seconds before you adjourned. He had a copy of my speech and said he was getting ready to read it. But, anyway, I am delighted to be here with you and I'm sorry I cut it quite that close, Jerry.

I have been asked to discuss the role of the National Task Force on the Continuing Education Unit. I do this with a great deal of pleasure since I have found my experience with the Task Force interesting and rewarding.

I would like, today, to structure my comments in three basic areas. First, a brief history of the formation of the Task Force. Second, report on the work done thus far, and finally, a projection of some future possibilities.

Preface

We are, in America today, engaged in coping with tremendous change. The fantastic array of alternatives facing most Americans is staggering. We have tremendous freedom to choose from a multiplicity of life styles, to creatively use an increasing amount of leisure time, to become (through the use of the mass communications media) a participant in events that are as far separated in space as Viet Nam or the moon.

Americans are living longer, and as our life line increases and the rate of change accelerates, we see more, do more, are called upon to know more than any group in the previous history of mankind. This need to know, this information revolution, this knowledge explosion is the central and driving force that provides those of us in Continuing Education with the reason and substance of our life's work.

Because the adult of today is called upon to increasingly make choices between alternatives, be it which candidate to vote for in an election or which cut of meat at the local grocery store will provide him with the best buy for the money, adults of today must continue

to learn throughout their life span. It is estimated that the continuing education portion of one's life is around forty-five years. Without structured educational opportunities, such as those offered by a sound program of continuing education, these learning efforts will inevitably become very haphazard and confused. They probably will not reflect an orientation toward a definite goal. And certainly, until now it has been difficult to measure one's progress along the way.

Well this problem, the lack of structure for a lifetime of learning, has preoccupied those of us in Continuing Education for a long, long time. It seems elementary that the enormous variety of non-credit continuing education conferences and workshops available should, in some way, compliment each other in a structured and progressive manner for the individual adult participant. But such, until recently, was not the case.

From what we have said, it is obvious that in this day of rapid and massive change, the adult must continue to learn if he is to remain an effective and efficiently functioning human resource. Those of us in the business of providing educational opportunities for the busy adult also realize that it is just as obvious that we must provide the adult with a way to measure and accumulate and be recognized for the wide range of non-credit learning experiences available to him. As you know, the CEU provides a way to do just that.

## History

After years of discussion of the above problem in our organizations, associations, and in private, a group of individuals decided that we wanted to meet to share our common concerns and see if anything could be done to solve them.

So, on July 1 and 2 of 1968 in Washington, D.C., a National Planning Conference was held to explore current needs, uses and feasibility of a uniform unit of measurement for non-credit continuing education programs. The conference was sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education, the U.S. Civil Service Commission, the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers and the National University Extension Association.

Invitations were sent to nine national education associations, fifteen professional and technical societies, three business and trade associations, two labor organizations, thirteen federal agencies, six private sector interests and three quasi-public organizations. These groups represented a cross-section of business, industry, labor, colleges, universities, federal agencies and professional groups known to have expressed a need for a uniform unit of measurement for short-term "learning experiences."

Response to the invitations was excellent. Forty-three persons, representing thirty-three organizations attended the meeting. We felt that this indicated a broadly based awareness of the problem.

At this conference, Paul Grogan of the University of Wisconsin, Bob Pitchell of the National University Extension Association and I presented a concept paper to initiate consideration and discussion. In this paper we pointed out that not only do present day circumstances require that an individual's formal education needs to be carried out over a longer period of time, but also that the extent of his specialization must be made sharper and the timetable of his self-renewal must be planned in a more systematic way.

We also pointed out that for purposes of national policy planning, no gross data are available on continuing education activities in a comprehensive fashion. Such is not the case with regular credit work done at elementary, secondary and higher educational institutions.

Other position papers were presented which indicated needs and views of other specific users of continuing education.

The views of one of the nation's largest employers and training organizations were presented by J. Kenneth Mulligan of the U.S. Civil Service Commission. He pointed out that over one million federal employees attended formal classroom training programs of eight hours or more in 1967. Of course, these numbers will have increased since that time, but considering these figures which applied to only the Federal Government at that time, we can project the national problem of accounting for educational activities.

Mr. Mulligan, at that first meeting stated that both producers and primary and secondary consumers of education want it as a method of satisfying consumers (students) that they are getting a certain quantity of valuable product, and students, as primary consumers, want it to assist in getting jobs for advancement in pay or rank. Employers, as secondary consumers, want it for hiring, promoting, planning (such as an inventory of available skills) and cost-benefit analysis.

Dean Russell Smith, speaking for the university extension divisions, said that universities need a uniform unit of measurement for their own internal reporting and planning from one year to the next in continuing education.

Len Brice of the American Society of Personnel Administrators reviewed the needs of professional societies in this field. He said a recognized unit of measurement for non-credit continuing education programs would be a boom to their professional societies' certification and accreditation efforts, besides giving additional stimulus to their development programs for members.

William Hardy, of the Education Department, of the United Auto Workers, discussed the need for a systematic approach from the para-professional view. He stated strongly the increasing desires of para-professional persons to expand professional entry training programs for professional growth and better job opportunities.

Two issues were made at this first meeting:

(1) We were researching the need for a uniform unit of measuring non-credit continuing education programs. We were not talking about a system of academic credits toward a degree or toward initial professional certification. The "academic credit hour" already takes care of this need.

(2) The scope of the problem should be broadly conceived.

The Conference agreed that there was a need for a uniform unit of measurement for non-credit continuing education activities; that a usable system appeared to rest in a unified and coordinated effort on the part of the consumer of the educational product as well as the producer, and finally, that a task force group representing the broad areas in attendance at the Conference should be appointed to develop a proposal for the unit of measurement. I was appointed Chairman of that group.

Other members are:

Vice-Chairman - Paul J. Grogan, University of Wisconsin
Special Assistant - Keith E. Glancy, Johns Hopkins University
Mr. Warren G. Ball, the American Medical Association
Mr. Leonard R. Brice, American Society for Personnel Administration
Mr. Edward H. Cox, E. I. duPont Company
Mr. Frank Dickey, The National Commission on Accrediting
Mr. Robert E. Ellis, The American Association of College Registrars and Admissions Officers
Mr. Reginald M. Jones, Jr., The U.S. Civil Service Commission
Mr. Treadway C. Parker, The American Management Association, Inc.
Dr. Robert J. Pitchell, National University Extension Association and,
Mr. Morris B. Ullman, the U.S. Office of Education

As you can imagine, of course, the Task Force has met frequently in the last four years.

## Summary of Work Done

In the period of 1968 to 1970 the Task Force developed preliminary definitions, recommendations and procedures. A progress report or "Interim Statement" was published in the spring of 1970 providing a definition for the recommended unit, suggested administrative requirements and applications and a rationalebehind the unit.

The Task Force recognized at an early date that a field test of the unit would be necessary and so an invitation was issued to the Division of Conferences and Institutes of NUEA to assist us with this field trial. Some 15 institutions responded and a pilot project was carried out during the 1970-71 school year. The report of this project indicated that the CEU was indeed a practical unit to measure non-credit continuing education activities, but that additional guidelines, and criteria would be helpful.

You have already heard of the action of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools in its revision of Accreditation Standard Number IX, which makes the use of the CEU mandatory for those colleges and universities in the eleven-state southeast region served by the Southern Association. It is the feeling of the Task Force that an updated and expanded statement on the CEU should be prepared without delay. The volume of inquiries received by members of the Task Force indicates that several professional organizations are giving consideration to the use of the CEU. The presence of those of you here today from some of these various organizations is further proof of it. But I am about to get ahead of my story.

Let me review breifly for you some of the specifics of the work of the Task Force before looking to future activities.

Those of you who have read the Interim Statement of the Task Force will recall that we said,

> "The purpose of the CEU is to provide a mechanism by which virtually all continuing education activities can be recorded. It is not expected, on the other hand, that all of the participation in terms of CEUs will have utility or transferability in terms of individual programs of career development. There would appear to be definite institutional and other sponsor advantages, however, in quantifying and recording the total amount of continuing education activity for which such organizations are responsible for purposes of input-output or cost-benefit analyses regardless of whether or not the continuing education units of all such activities have commercial or professional implications."

More specific detail, much of it taken from the Interim Statement of the Task Force, is available in the handout you were provided at registration entitled "General Information on the Continuing Education Unit." So with this in your hands, I won't belabor specific points. Let me summarize the work done thus far as follows:

(1) First of all, we have what we feel to be a workable and practical definition of the standard unit of measurement of non-credit activity which we sought.

(2) We have defined the purposes and objectives of this unit in a way which gives it a structure and yet broad applicability and flexibility.

(3) We have designed and defined the administrative requirements that are necessary to provide the unit with a qualitative value as well as the quantitative value of the definition.

(4) We have field tested the unit in the everyday world of continuing education and found it workable.

We do realize, of course, that a good many new questions have arisen. This factor, perhaps, leads us to the final section of our conversation this afternoon.

## Future Plans

Two major areas of concern seem to have emerged. The Task Force is working on both. And at our last Task Force Meeting in Washington last month, each of these areas was discussed.

First there seems to be evolving a need for a "National Handbook on the CEU." A document that would detail much more precisely the activities and processes necessary to standardize operations of continuing education with reference to the use of the CEU. The Task Force is involved in efforts to secure funding to develop research and production for such a Handbook.

Secondly, there is a great deal of discussion of the method of record-keeping for the CEU, and many people have raised the question of the possibility of establishing a National Center for Record Keeping for the CEU. Conversations have been under way for some time between the Task Force and various groups who may be interested in providing this service. Obviously it will be necessary to first reach national agreement on exactly what amount of detail will be required in such record keeping systems. While this is, of course, going to be a tremendous task, we do not feel it will be insurmountable. The Task Force will continue to work at these problems and to inform the continuing education community of developments.

Summary

The CEU grew out of the need to answer the question, "How do you recognize and give identity for achievement to a wide range of people for their involvement in conferences, institutes . . . short-term learning experiences?"

I feel that this question has been answered by the development of the CEU.

The Task Force is committed to a continuing examination and evaluation of the CEU and its attendant processes. The broad and representative membership of the Task Force helps insure that problems are given broad and representative consideration.

Further, in addition to the action of the Southern Association, there are other indications of wide receptivity to the CEU concept. This is not to say that the CEU will not undergo a process of development and refinement as its use becomes more widespread, but it seems to me, based on the experience thus far, that we have a viable concept whose use will indeed become more widespread if not universal in this nation.

DR. W. L. FLOWERS, VIRGINIA TECH

Are there any questions you would like to put to Dr. Turner in response to the kind of in-depth involvement that he has experienced in developing the CEU concept?

DR. BILL TURNER, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION, NORTH CAROLINA

Incidentally, let me say we at the Task Force, Bill, are completely open to any suggestions, any ideas or any new developments you would like to pass on to us. The Task Force has always been a very open and a very responsive group. Thank you very much. If there are no questions -- thank you for a very sizable turnout today.

DR. W. L. FLOWERS, VIRGINIA TECH

I believe he perceives the thing that we did as we began to address ourselves to a study of this exciting concept. There is a great deal of need that has been expressed by people who are the receivers of educational programs in this country. There is a great deal of response that has been made from business and industry and there continues to be a kind of interest in this concept which is going to require each of you as an institutional representative to be instrumental in assisting your institutions in understanding the CEU. If you are going to be instrumental in addressing the question of how to avoid some of the blind spots that you might hear cited during this conference, you will need to be aware of key concepts as you apply these to help develop

institutional policies and procedures. The users of education have a great voice in this. They have expressed this voice through the Task Force and through the individual members of business and industry.

INTRODUCTION OF MR. CARL F. TRIPP, UNION CARBIDE

We have a special treat today to hear from a person who is from industry.

Mr. Carl F. Tripp is Manager of Marketing Personnel Development of the chemicals and plastics of the Union Carbide Corporation. He holds a B.S. in Chemical Engineering from Montana University, an M.S. in Business Policy, and he has been involved in the Columbia Graduate School of Business as late as this year. He attended Montana School of Mines doing some study there earlier, as did he the University of California at San Diego as part of his education effort.

He joined Union Carbide in 1952. He held various technical and sales positions until 1959, and then he became the Regional Product Manager. He came to New York City in 1960 and held various other responsible positions in that industry. He is currently responsible for the design and the implementation of a marketing and sales educational system which was begun in 1969.

His activities include at the present time the supervision of business education programs and the operation of the Personnel Development Laboratory at Tarrytown. He has written, just as many of us in the education realm have. Some of his recent reports have appeared in national publications. In the past year and this year, July of 1971, his writings appeared in Publication and Industry Week; a publication in AM Management Review in August, 1971; another in Chemical Week in May, 1971; Chemical Engineering News in May, 1971; and Business Week in February, 1972.

From the area of industry, it is a pleasure for me to present to you, Carl F. Tripp.

MR. CARL F. TRIPP

Thank you Bill. It will be interesting to see how much trouble I can get into today. I think it is one thing for a group of educators like yourselves to have an intellectual discussion, but to bring in someone like me who has spent most of my career in business working on the fringes of the educational world is kind of inviting disaster in many ways, perhaps. I should qualify just one thing that you said, Bill. Those references to the publications were not all authored articles, but they were reports on things we have done in the last couple of years which I think are a bit out of the ordinary. I think one thing that that list of job titles did was to give me an excuse, at least, for not understanding what Gordon referred to earlier as the accrediting process, because I don't. I don't have a good understanding of it, and I'm afraid today I may abuse your terminology a little bit, and I want to apologize for that in advance. But I do have some thoughts, and I wanted to share them with you, and you can pick and choose from them for what value they may have.

I hope that if I leave some things unsaid or unclear during the next half hour that you will raise them either as questions at the end of our time here or during the hospitality hour that's next on the program.

I'd like to make it clear from the very beginning that I think the Southern Association can and should be very proud of the leadership role it has taken in this extremely important area of continuing education.

I'd also like you to know a couple of things about me. First, that I am very appreciative of all that has gone into your effort; and second, that my goal is to help you in any way I can to see that this effort continues to go forward. As I'm sure you all know better than I, we're not talking about just some isolated happening in the field of education but of a whole new era, of a major contribution we can make to business certainly but even more importantly to our country, its productivity and to many, many of its people who have the need and the desire to make personal improvements through education and to be recognized for having made them.

I've divided my comments into three general categories. First, what business has been doing -- second, what new opportunities and options are now open to it because of your work -- third, some of my concerns and hopes for the future.

The role of education in business has been and will continue to be one of growing importance. The major corporation especially, with its complexity of missions and people, presents an educational challenge of unusual magnitude to both the company itself and to those who deal with the need either as individuals within the enterprise or as part of the academic world. My company, Union Carbide, is a good example of this growing complexity. Started in 1910 when Dr. Leo Bakeland invented the first plastic which came to be known as Bakelite, it has grown steadily throughout the years. It now encompasses more than 12 separate divisions representing over three billion dollars in sales of products which range

all the way from consumer goods such as Eveready Batteries, Prestone, Star Saphires, and Glad Wrap through a line of chemicals like those used in the manufacture of pesticides, transistors, paints and polishes, to a variety of plastic products for industrial and home use and some highly specialized items used to freeze food, launch rockets and burn holes through thick steel plates.

You don't run a business like this without an abundance of well-prepared, knowledgeable men and women. The decisions being made on a daily basis this year make some of those facing our businessmen at the turn of the century seem like child's play. I expect this complexity to continue on its upward course indefinitely. If a company wants to participate successfully in that sophisticated environment, its need for those educated people will be enormous.

Incidentally, when I use the word "educated" as I just did, or when I think of education as a process, it's not in the traditional sense. The thing I have in mind is more like a kaleidescope. You remember those delightful children's playthings you held up to your eye, pointed toward the light and turned; well my educational kaleidescope is composed of a series of learning experiences and work experiences which, in true kaliedescope fashion, are constantly changing in the way they fit together as the world in which they exist turns and turns.

To carry the analogy a little further, the different shapes and patterns the parts in the kaliedescope assume are accomplished solely by rearranging a closed system of bits and pieces. Perhaps there was a time when much of our formal education was that way too, but what we're dealing with now is certainly no closed system. The influx of new technology to every field of business is awe inspiring and I'm not thinking only, or even primarily, of the so-called scientific fields.

Marketing for instance has undergone tremendous change in the last decade or so. Once looked upon by many people as something of an art, it is now generously seasoned with mathematics, behavioral science, statistics, computer technology, and the like. The proficient application, and that's a key word -- "application", of these fields makes the difference between the winners and the also-rans.

The point I want to make is that the people who work in the various parts of the business, who cause it to move in the way it should in order for the whole enterprise to succeed, must be educated in this broad sense. They must, collectively, know a lot about the technology -- they must know how to apply it -- they must in fact make that application of their knowledge to the work that needs doing. So, for my purposes, the man or woman isn't educated until he or she can do all three. Just going to school won't make it happen, experience can't do it alone and certainly not within the given time constraints.

It only happens best when we get it all together, and I think that's where what you're doing and what we're doing really begin to merge and depend on one another for ultimate success. Business has an increasing need for specialists in many, many fields but it needs flexibility too. Specialists in a given area at one point in time must be allowed to move into other areas as the times change. Indeed, this movement must be facilitated in order to avoid individual obsolescence on the one hand and pools of stagnant manpower within the company on the other.

Capping off a career series of these specialized efforts, there will be the need for the successful businessman to refocus his knowledge and talents on still another area -- that of general management. Again, in today's world and tomorrow's it is my opinion that effective general management can be markedly enhanced by a formal approach to learning as well as by experience.

It's interesting to consider an indication of the change that has already occurred in this latter respect. Around 1900 only one out of eight heads of successful businesses in the U. S. had a college degree. Today, only 70 years later and that really isn't very long in our terms, it's not uncommon for the companies these men founded to require at least a bachelors degree for salaried entry positions. In 1964, when the Council for Financial Aid to Education made this study of the backgrounds of America's top executives, it found the number of them with college training had increased from the 12% I referred to a minute ago to 89% and of that number, one-third had gone on for advanced degrees. The demand placed on colleges and universities has accordingly been great and they have, for the most part, responded admirably. At the present time over 600 schools offer full business programs, with more than 100 carrying them to the graduate level. But as you know, it can't end there.

The need for knowledge, for business education in that broad sense, not as measured just by counting the MBA's hired each year but the real need as it permeates the business organization, is still increasing steadily. More to the point here today, the nature of that educational requirement has changed and is still changing. The traditional business school curriculum will not, in my opinion, even with its specialized majors, satisfy the needs that are developing.

Unfortunately, it's not at all clear that the learning institution, as it is usually configured, is in the best position to meet the challenge this need has created. It might be more convenient if it were, but it's not too surprising that it's not. Meaningful learning and skill development come about only through faithful adherence to the learning process we all know exists. Real understanding and in turn behavioral change come about only after knowledge is reinforced by experience.

We know too that these acquisition areas are not most efficient or effective when they are separated or insulated from one another. This certainly isn't a new thought to anyone who has considered the matter to a reasonable extent, but it is an important thought when one is trying to decide just how the job at hand might best be accomplished. The same notion, I feel sure, contributed strongly to Harvard's sponsorship in 1935 of the Business Executives Discussion Groups led by Professor Philip Cabot. Just as your Association is enlarging the horizon now, they were the pioneers in the so-called short courses for executives that have proliferated ever since.

I believe these short courses have made and are still making in some areas, a very significant contribution to the business needs but, and this is a big one, they are not, and to my way of thinking, cannot in their present form keep up with the needs of the future. Their quality and impact has varied widely from the beginning. Their principle significance is in what they symbolize -- a desire for knowledge and for help, an exchange of experiences by businessmen, and a willingness of business schools to attempt an offering within the brief periods of time in which businessmen feel they can leave their jobs. Naive? Perhaps, but the growth of the idea of continuing education and the coming together of men in business with school faculties for such courses was an important development which has led to significant changes both in education and in business.

The discussions you're having today and tomorrow are, I feel, an important manifestation of that action. Man's unique ability to build on one anothers ideas, to continually innovate, has in no small measure been responsible for his greatness. Of course, to build onto something you must have the something to start with -- that's knowledge. To make the building process progressive this knowledge must be continually updated so that the new product is better than the old.

That certainly can be an argument for education in general but more specifically I was talking about publicly offered short courses for business people and one of the things they have been meant to do is update that knowledge base. The question at this point is -- did they, or do they do it satisfactorily? For some few I think we have to say yes, but my belief is that most have, because of their time constraints, less depth than is desirable and the usual problem of providing a bridge by which the attendee can bring back what he has learned to the job. The short courses have more working against them than just the short time in which they attempt to accomplish their objectives. Attendees have shown concern for the value of such offerings and the need to leave their offices, homes and families for extended periods of time. Once there, the learning experiences may be interspersed with a goodly amount of social activities which, in some cases at least, do not contribute much to skill development.

All of these things have been recognized by you and other educators like you. However, lacking the availability of an outstanding in-company effort, everyone in business has just had to seek out the best of what was available. Many companys rely solely on the individual's initiative to get what he needs through home study courses or night school. Both, if properly supervised, are apt to provide a more in-depth learning experience than the executive seminars, but they are far more time consuming and are resorted to by a relative few.

In an effort to accomplish more, some companies send their higher potential people to extended courses such as the Harvard Advanced Management Series or Columbia's six week program in business administration. I feel sure that more learning takes place at this type of session than at the shorter version. But again, there are still the time pressures and some of the other factors associated with the short courses.

For what they believe is maximum benefit, a few schools around the country offer special forms of degree granting programs for executives. They vary in format from MIT's Sloan Program at one extreme requiring a full school year away from the job to those still relying on night work but concentrating it in such a way that a full program is completed in two years.

In between there are some fine arrangements like the one started at the University of Chicago sometime ago. I may be biased because I'm just completing my two years in Columbia's masters degree program for executives but I feel they are an optimal combination of work and learning experiences. In these, the businessman-student attends class for one or two days during the week. The school allows some credit for work experience and at the end of the established time awards a masters level degree. However, the number of men and women that can be educated in this way is relatively small, the programs tend to be on the expensive side, they're still quite broad in nature, they require an extraordinary commitment on the company's part and demand a considerable time and effort expenditure by the man or woman who is attending and at the same time working a full time job.

W[illegible]t's see, where does that leave us? I've said for one thing that the [illegible]and for education by business is increasing, for another that the natu[illegible]f the demand is changing so that we'll need more specialists but that these specialists will have to be mobile. I've registered by feeling that a strong individual effort deserves and maybe even demands recognition. I've raised the question of who is in the best position to satisfy the needs -- schools or business, and also the question of how the need satisfaction can best be accomplished. We've explored several of the existing approaches now available and I've tried to identify what I thought were their strengths and weaknesses.

I feel quite sure that at this point you can see why I'm enthusiastic about the CEU and its promise for the future. It represents, still in unfinished form I admit, institutional response to the continuing need for education in business that I've been talking about. It speaks to the recognition need, to the need for record-keeping over extended periods, to the possibility of high quality education integrated with work experience and to a relatively new awareness that non-traditional course forms are, under certain circumstances, even more valuable to business than are the traditional.

One thing I haven't touched on that must be considered in any deliberation of this sort is the present state of the art of in-company educational programs. I frankly am not familiar with many of the ongoing efforts. Of those that I do know a little or more than a little about, a few things can be said.

The business education giants like IBM and General Electric Company seem to have excellent programs for their employees. They, like others such as Union Carbide who are really trying to do a credible job, utilize a mixed faculty that brings together, we all hope, the best of our two worlds. It is not uncommon to have professors, executives from within the company and businessmen with specialized knowledge from other companies come together during the implementation of a well organized effort. Of course, the better school-offered executive programs take the same approach but the in-company presentations have the distinct advantage of being able to zero-in more closely on their company's specific need. So to the company and the man at some given point in time the learning experience they provide could be more valuable than the amount of traditional course work that could be accomplished in the same period.

Incidentally, the amount of time spent in these activities is worth a quick comment. A one-week seminar at Union Carbide can involve 40 or more contact hours of study, so a three-week advanced management program at IBM will exceed 100 and the eight-week course in general management that General Electric offers runs well over 300 hours. That's enough time to do a lot of learning.

In many companies I suspect the record-keeping system of these activities leaves a lot to be desired. Names and dates of attendance may be available but educationally meaningful details of content are most probably not. An unfortunate consequence is that programs are not looked upon or designed as building blocks in a career education plan. Instead, each one tries to cover the current waterfront. There is duplication and as a result, it sort of gets to be like going to the circus -- seen one, seen 'em all! From the business-learners point of view this can mean only one or two programs he will attend during his career. Even if they were three weeks or eight weeks long, the time frame in which they are administered make them hardly enough to last a man for 30 or 40 years. This strikes me as being another tremendous opportunity to make use of the CEU. Maybe not right away, but I believe

the trend toward closer and closer company-university relationships is clearly there and where the regular credit system is not a viable measuring device for one reason or another the CEU could be a valuable tool. For instance, in Carbide's New York office we offered one seminar series last year which I feel had an especially significant learning potential. We convened the same group one afternoon a week for 11 weeks to study pricing strategies and methods. Two business school professors alternated weekly, each leading an average of three cases per session. Toward the end of the allotted time class members were asked to prepare comprehensive cases from their own experience which were in turn critically reviewed by one or both of the professors, improved or refined by the businessman-student, and then discussed by the class.

This combination of text reading, case reading and discussion followed by supervised application to real product pricing problems would, I feel, compare favorably to any course on the subject being offered at any college or university. In fact, there probably isn't a course now in existence which covers the same subject matter in equivalent depth.

There were, in CEU terms, more than 40 contact hours available to each student. I think it would have been quite proper to make some permanent record of their achievement. What they learned was applicable to one part of a product manager's job in any division within our corporation -- and I suspect on the outside too. No company wants to lose people by advertising how well they've been trained, but the extra learning incentive provided by having some unit of widely recognized credit given I believe would have been considerable and worth the slight risk involved.

We need to get completely away from the cake frosting approach to special business education. The CEU can be our recording device if it is used properly. Career learning plans can be made and followed so that more men and women can undergo better preparation for their careers, and companies guided by this additional information on their employee, can make better placement and promotion decisions.

One of the keys in this, it seems to me, will be a good quality control system. As I read Standard Nine, that's a big part of what it's all about. A guide for how things must be handled is essential to getting the whole program rolling on a large scale. It has been, and is going to be, a lot of work. But the time to prepare for quality and uniformity is in the beginning. Straightening out a tangled affair 10 years from now would be more difficult, less satisfying and the damage that would have been done in the meantime could delay meaningful progress another ten years.

Well, let's assume for a minute or two that it's a few years from now, that Standard Nine and others like it are doing the job and that we've got a system of CEU educational efforts underway. How can a company like mine make use of them? Perhaps I can illustrate by taking you on

an imaginary career-learning plan excursion. Let's say we've just hired a young chemical engineer from a reputable university, in the south of course, to become a part of the marketing force for one of our departments which deals in organic polymers, inorganic catalysts, silicone surfactants and fluorocarbon gases. This is not an unlikely combination since that is a group of products commonly sold into the same market and one by the way in which I have been personally involved. Well, right off we have education problems or opportunities.

Aside from the conventional orientation programs all new hires get, this young person needs to be given special product training, since few schools, even if they deal with the chemical families I mentioned, ever get into the functioning of the product system they represent. If he gets as part of his sales training period 25 hours of approved instruction and spends four or five days of laboratory application work on say silicone surfactants, this should be duly recorded for several reasons.

He now has some amount of knowledge not even available in most colleges. He does, if the course was properly administered, now know enough about silicone surfactants to qualify him as a sales representative, but he may only know part of what he needs if his career path turns later to sales-service rather than straight sales. If it does, he'll need more specialized training but there should be no need to go back over what he has already studied. Similar knowledge requirements exist for all of the products mentioned and they should be treated accordingly. By the time our young man or woman gets into his first field assignment, he has already taken a big step toward mastery of the first chosen area of specialization. That knowledge which he has acquired will have some lasting value as his career proceeds. It should become a part of his permanent skills inventory - there for reference -- there for planning -- there as a building block in his continuing education plan.

Now, after he gets his Houston-based territory under control, our junior businessman can begin to implement his plan for the more distant future. And what a dazzling array will await his selection. A whole host of schools and colleges throughout the south will be offering opportunities for his learning satisfaction, or perhaps an association such as the Petroleum Institute will be sponsoring a CEU accredited program on some facet of their industry. And although that market area is not his responsibility now, any extended career in the south and southwest will surely bring him into contact with it sooner or later.

Maybe even two noncompetitive companies like IBM and Union Carbide can pool their resources in certain areas to sponsor a joint program on some specialized facet of industry where both chemical agents and computer controlled processes bring the two companies onto common ground. In any of these cases, the implementation of a Standard Nine will insure that the training he gets will have career value and will be carried on his record in CEUs as an indication to his employer that he has something special to offer.

As another example of what could be, and one that will lead to my concluding remarks, let's assume our southern representative has managerial aspirations and wants to begin planning for the day when he'll be responsible for the work of others. Ongoing programs in group behavior or practical psychology designed perhaps to help teachers in their continuing education can be used to prepare him too. Or later on a national training laboratories program will be available somewhere in his area to provide valuable insights to his personal impact and management style. If they have been qualified to grant CEU credit, these experiences will be more meaningful and can be recorded in a far more uniform manner than has previously been the practice.

As he moves on throughout his career, he can continue his education, keeping himself prepared to do a better job in today's assignment and making himself ready for the challenges tomorrow will bring. The educational experiences will be integrated into his work life so that both benefit from each other. Each can be planned to build on the ones that have gone before and the combination of all will lead, not in a rigid overly structured way, but in a contemporary richly textured fashion, to a full career made better and more satisfying by that feeling associated with keeping fit -- mentally fit to do the best job.

But all of this will be possible only if the schools, the companies, the associations and the independent training institutions are participating in the system made possible by the CEU.

As the national task force has recognized, a lot of work remains to be done before this will be possible. I think they are willing to guide the effort on its way, but they can't do it all alone. They need the kind of support your Southern Association has shown, and they need to have business, government and interested professional and industrial organizations in there pushing too. For a national company like ours only a nationwide system will provide the real equity in opportunity, measurement and recording that I think is needed.

The first step in this direction is for us to take fullest advantage of your work and of the school-sponsored courses which will become available under Standard Nine. Those most familiar with the criteria of higher education must set the example for how non-traditional programming can be made just as respectable as its traditional forerunner. Then perhaps we can look to the time when institutionally supervised, but privately sponsored efforts can be added to the approved list. Union Carbide now sponsors programs in Texas, Puerto Rico, West Virginia, Louisiana, New Jersey, Tarrytown, New York and in New York City which I believe would qualify for CEU recognition and I think someday they should have it.

Our company employs over 100,000 people around the world with about half of them here in the U. S. We want the best for them and for ourselves and a better, more meaningful education is part of this. If we're to have a true manpower resource we need to get people ready and to keep them ready no matter where they are. The CEU and Standard Nine can help us do that.

However, there are some things that bother me. Many of our people want to continue their educational pursuits in a more formal way. They want the preparation and recognition that advanced degrees imply and in most cases provide. If that were the case with my hypothetical salesman in Houston, he could be faced with many obstacles and much frustration along the way. Transfers or promotions can cause him to physically relocate many times before he reaches a headquarters location. In most cases, all or part of his credit is lost if he changes schools. The desire to avoid this can, at the present time, get in his way and ours. This anomoly of circumstances is as much to be scorned as is the need for students or businessmen to avoid institutional education because it lacks relevance. I don't mean to belittle either situation, but I do believe they can both be eliminated if responsible people on all sides continue to exert the effort that seems to be developing.

One day I would like to see a more open university system at least to the extent where credit transfer would be greatly facilitated and meaningful work projects such as a company's long range plans can be accorded the academic weight of a traditional thesis. Good standards it seems to me are a key to the broader recognition I advocate. Working with the CEU and Standard Nine are clearly on the right road even though they may not be an end in themselves. Many attitudes will have to change along the way from where we are now to where I think we want to end up.

Continued educational achievement should be built into our compensation programs. It should also become an integral part of job descriptions at every level up to and including general manager. Maybe, as a friend of mine said the other day, degrees granted should have expiration dates extendable only by continued educational pursuit. With that thought I am reminded that most of my remarks have, and I think quite properly, been focused on those in business. There are many things that should be said about those who have not been so fortunate. There isn't time to do it now, but we should not forget T. Levitt summarized, "Just as children go to school longer, so will he. He will return to seminars, workshops and other devices for his continuing education in order to keep up with the knowledge that constitutes both his resources and his incentive."

The requirement for study and "keeping-up" is not confined to electrical engineers, aerodynamicists and other highly educated professionals. The machinist in the shop faces the same necessity, lest numerical control make him totally obsolete. The new machines require him constantly to

to renew his skills. There is no escape - not even for the plant manager or for the corporate treasurer, lest he be obsoleted by operations research, simulation, the management grid, theory Y, or new pronouncements about the superior virtue of the free-floating organizational structure.

In this respect they are the same. Top management in a business such as ours recognizes that the personal goals of an employee are a very important consideration. They and the company's objectives must be in harmony in order for the most beneficial performances to occur. Personal growth is one of these goals, visible facilitation of it must be one of the company's objectives. But education is not just a goal. It is in a very real sense a tool for survival -- of man in his environment and of a company in its.

Discussion Period

DR. W. L. FLOWERS, VIRGINIA TECH

How much does your company spend each year for education out of that three billion dollars that is not channeled through a university or college?

MR. CARL TRIPP, UNION CARBIDE

Right now it is very hard to identify just how much is spent and that is going to tie into the things we were talking about. We spend millions of dollars. I frankly would not want to quote a number that is not accurate. I would say that at the present time 75% of it is not spent through an educational institution.

DR. W. L. FLOWERS, VIRGINIA TECH

Could you say why?

MR. CARL TRIPP, UNION CARBIDE

Well, I think convenience is a factor -- that there are isolated locations where a great number of people need training. I think relevant too is that in the minds of some people we are the most capable of putting together those things that help. There is not a realization that this can be done in other ways. What they've seen in the past does not bear testimony to it.

WALTER ALLAN, CONTINUING EDUCATION DIRECTOR, LAKE SUMTER COMMUNITY COLLEGE

From the vantage point of 25 years, more or less active years, of industry, I've had a little background in some of the problems I think you gentlemen face. In personnel, you undoubtedly keep a record of the educational experience of your people in training -- the bright young men that are coming along now currently, and probably you list the courses by name as well as duration and so forth as these people complete them. How will the adoption of the CEU change your procedure for evaluation and how will it avoid becoming a situation of brownie points?

MR. CARL TRIPP, UNION CARBIDE

Well, lets see if I can keep up with you. The records that I think are kept now in the best fashion are those where employees have participation in formal educational programs as students. This is partly because we have an educational refund program which requires that in order to get the money back, the records must be kept. The kinds of programs in which there are not meaningful records are the kinds that we are endeavoring to run internally in order to do something about keeping our people up-to-date. But we do keep track of the names and the

people that attend, and someone like myself trys to keep track of the kinds of programs offered and what was in them. But the way the audience turns over, it is difficult to design building blocks in any kind of an intentional plan to upgrade a man.

So what I would do, for instance, at our programs is, if we had access to the CEU, begin to concentrate with say 40 hours in a one-week program on some meaningful segment of education or learning or subject matter and then try to build on that the next time through rather than try three times a year like I said to cover the waterfront.

MADISON E. WEIDNER, RUTGERS UNIVERSITY, EXTENSION DIVISION

There has been over the years somewhat of a cyclical tendency in industrial training of the larger cooperations undertaking these large schools on their own. I can remember 30 years ago Western Electric had a tremendous program of its own and that program waned and they sent their people out. Now they're setting up a big continuing education center again to train their own people. What seems to be the general long-range trend in this field? I know that the cyclical movement may be budget caused but what is the long-range trend in your opinion?

MR. CARL TRIPP, UNION CARBIDE

In my opinion? Well, I'm glad you left me out. As I said, I think the trend is toward some sort of a closer relationship between the company and the university. It may become a bit specific like the Western Electric thing. Certain companies have problems of one need over another. In the conversations that I have had I detect a considerable reluctance on the part of the colleges and universities, in the business area, to get too close to this sort of thing. So I expect it is going to be difficult. After we ran that one program I described, I had quite a conversation with the two professors who were involved and they felt that what they had done and what we had accomplished in that program was in fact as meaningful as many of the things they did in their school.

JOSEPH J. SEMROW, NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION

I was wondering why doesn't your company adopt the CEU now?

MR. CARL TRIPP, UNION CARBIDE

Well, I'm not sure what you mean when you say adopt the CEU but I'll tell you one reason I don't think we should use it. That is that I don't think the kinds of programs we have right now are the right kinds to apply it to. I think that knowing we have the opportunity to use it, we try to make our programs sufficiently meaningful. I don't think that you can just take 40 hours of miscellaneous kinds of subject coverage and put some degree of credit on it. I don't want to do that.

JAMES A. CHINN, BROWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE, PLANTATION, FLORIDA

In talking about relevance of what the university staff can do in aiding you in your training programs for your personnel, do you see the CEU as a way of allowing you to do things that you want to do in terms of relevance and us give the credit for it? Would this be an incentive to your personnel to gain these blue chips by doing what you want him to do? Are you seeing it in that light or what do you mean by saying how does CEU help in terms of making things relevant in terms of training personnel?

MR. CARL TRIPP, UNION CARBIDE

Well, I think the first requirement for me would be that of CEU becoming a nationally recognized unit of credit, and then I think that it should be institutionally supervised. Whether that means a coordinating committee, a monitoring group or what, I don't know. As long as it's recognized so that the man feels that no matter where he goes, it means the same thing to the person that looks at it as it does to him. I tried to make the analogy with the product training, if he got five credits so to speak in CEUs in Silicone Chemistry, I'd like that to be good evidence to anyone he shows it to -- that he understands some given amount. You have to define all that, and I don't think we in our programs have done that. I think we would have to before we could give CEUs.

MINOR HAWK, UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

I would take issue on that remark you made relative to the value of your courses because during your talk you mentioned how valuable those courses were to your people. The vice-chairman of the Task Force, Paul Grogen, makes a statement that I concur with 100%. He says the beauty of the CEU is in the eyes of the beholder. Now we can't accredit everyone who is offering continuing education courses. It might be a labor union; it might be a governmental agency; or it might be private entrepreneurs or whatever. You cannot possibly get an accreditation for all of these people who are offering the courses. So I would suggest, just as Paul says, that it is in the eyes of the beholder. If it has value to your men, then it's worth something. If it's not worth anything, then don't give it.

MR. CARL TRIPP, UNION CARBIDE

I would like to respond just briefly to that. I'm glad you take issue with it. I suspect that maybe somewhere in between what you're talking about and where I have inferred I am is perhaps a meeting ground. I don't want it to be quite the way you said.

ED LOREY, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI - ROLLA

I'd like to second what Dean Hawk said. The CEU is not designed specifically for educational institutions in terms of offering this.

It was to be some concept of performance, and I believe in some of the initial discussions I heard said, "why not, some of the best programs in the world are offered through industry." Why should not industry do this? We are talking about qualified instruction, responsibility of the organization, so I don't think that even though most here are from universities, and we are talking about an accrediting concept from the Association, that certainly should not limit our thinking at this point in time.

MR. CARL TRIPP, UNION CARBIDE

Well, I certainly respect your opinion. I have a little concern over it being a runaway thing. I think that there has to be some control exerted over it or it is not going to be meaningful. It can be real nice to us, but if it's not going to carry the weight I would like to see it carry, it won't be helpful.

DR. WILLIAM L. FLOWERS, VIRGINIA TECH

I guess somewhere in all of this there is another thought too. In the last several years, the universities have been getting increasingly smaller support from various points around and some of us have asked about who in the education business or who out of the education business should be developing new programs. I think that we are going to hear something of this point touched upon tonight and probably tomorrow morning. Just now we are goint to adjourn this session and you're invited to the banquet which follows.

Banquet Remarks

DR. W. L. FLOWERS, VIRGINIA TECH

Out of Washington, many of you know this man well. We have a gentleman who has a few remarks for us, Mr. Paul Delker. He is with the HEW Division of Adult Education in the Bureau of Vocational, Adult and Technical Education. Paul has been extremely helpful in the preparation of this conference and we are happy to have him and his lovely wife, Jean, join us for this session. Mr. Delker, we would like very much to hear from you and the thoughts you are having about the conference thus far.

MR. PAUL DELKER, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

If you read the fine print of your program, on the left hand side you observed that it is the privilege of the Division of Adult Education, of which I am Director, to be a co-sponsor of this institute, and I'm most grateful to Bill Flowers who dispatched Jerry Hargis a day several months ago to propose the idea for an opportunity to be a co-sponsor of these deliberations. This is my first trip to Blacksburg. I am most impressed with the arrangements and I'm especially impressed with the weather that Bill and Jerry have arranged. My wife and I drove down today and the weather couldn't be better and the weather bureau says that it is going to hold up until we get back on Saturday. As someone who depends on the National Weather Bureau in Washington, I consider that kind of arrangement indicative of a very high skill.

I'd like to share with you what really is the interest of the Office of Education, especially the Division of Adult Education, in the Continuing Education Unit. The mission of the Division of Adult Education, is to promote broader and better adult and continuing education services throughout the United States. I think as a manifestation of our improved ability to carry out this mission, we recently received approval for the restructuring of our organization. And for purposes of the CEU it involves the creation of a new branch. It is the mission of this branch to pay major attention to the future of Adult and Continuing Education and to the promotion of broader and better programs in Adult and Continuing Education. The branch has a very unpretentious title, "Program Development Branch," so without the explanation that you had, you probably wouldn't perceive from the title that that's its major mission.

I'd like to talk a few minutes about what I consider to be the future of Adult and Continuing Education -- for I perceive not only from the point of view of national need but from the point of view of national need within the Office of Education vis-a-vis Adult and Continuing Education, that we are on the threshold of radical change in educational philosophy. That this change will very likely affect a profound change in

our educational system. And I'm referring to what I can best summarize as a philosophy of life-long learning as a basis of our education system. Now this is more than a change of rhetoric. The antecedent to the philosophy of life-long learning was Adult and Continuing Education, the field that we have all been laboring in for some time. The Adult and Continuing Education antecedent has been based on a system of education which defined universal education as a prescribed number of years of formal education to which were added, for some of its citizens, adult education experiences. Life-long learning does not prescribe or will not prescribe a certain number of years. It would not increase from the current twelve or fourteen, whichever way you want to interpret it, to 16 or 18, but it would prescribe that all adults learn throughout their life-span. I predict this will become the new definition of universal education in our society.

Now, if I am right, if this happens, there are profound systemic changes indicated, because the system which you and I are now dealing with is basically terminal education to which for some of the more fortunate of us are added adult and continuing educational experiences. The rhetoric of career education which I know you have all heard is based on this concept of life-long learning. To be sure, since the major dollars in education do go into the elementary and secondary system, the initial interest has been on articulating models in relation to career education in these systems. But if you read the speeches of Commissioner Marland and look carefully at the models, there is underlying career education, acceptance of the principal of life-long learning. I think this is very prophetic. The Division of Adult Education is now working on the conceptionalization and articulation of the adult portions, the adult systems or sub-systems of career education.

I was very pleased with Mr. Tripp's remarks, before he had to go to the plane, but I think he articulated very well a portion of one of the models of career education. I'm not going to spend a great deal of time on this, but let me give you a rather simple, but I don't think simplistic, analysis of the complexity of the problem. All adults in this country for purposes of adult education can be put into one of two groups -- the group the people who have careers and the group of people who do not have careers. When we analyze the work force we find that only about one out of three adults in the work force are in the first category. The problem for that group was well articulated by Mr. Tripp, the need for which I think we have quite well called continuing education. For the other 2/3, we have the problem of creating career capability where it does not exist. The average member of that work force, if we count his or her first job (the first one which they held for six months or longer) changes jobs twelve times in a 46 year work life, and holds jobs which bear no relation or very little relationship to one another. We must add to that group at present 5 million unemployed and the development of models which will create career capability for this group. It is, as you know, a tremendous task and one which we have never mastered.

Well, continuing with, or rather returning to, my remarks about the future direction of life-long learning and adult education, our division has recently authorized a long-range study, of adult and continuing education in the United States to guide us in the formulation of public policy in relation to the future needs of our society and the rapid change which has been well cited already by other speakers. This study is being carried out by the Center for Educational Policy at Syracuse University. We project it will take 2 1/2 years to complete but obviously we can't wait that long so we will have interim reports to guide us in the articulation of policy and this is appropriate because policy articulation at the national level is incremental and evolutionary rather than single and revolutionary.

Now what does all of this have to do with the Continuing Education Unit? It is very important in our deliberations this evening and tomorrow that we do not lose sight of this background. I've heard many things about the benefits of the CEU and I share them. I agree with them and I'm supportive of the CEU. I hope that my involvement in the sponsorship is evidence of that. And I was somewhat reassured by Mr. Tripp's comments, but I do have my reservations. They stem from what I would like to describe as the ecology of education. First of all, the consumer is not here. Now, I'm not an advocate that every conference must include the clientele. I think that there are tasks proper to workshops and conferences to which the clientele's presence is absolutely antithetical. But I don't think that's the case here. Because as I understand the purpose, it is to develop a new system which will bring better service to the client; the learner; but the learner is not here. I haven't heard enough sensivity to the ecology of education. I've heard a lot about the institutional benefits, the transfer of benefits but predominantly it seems to me that what is being advocated here are benefits to the establishment and the current institutions rather than a clear articulation of the benefits to the learner. An institutional change is not only the requirement of the present but it will increasingly be the requirement of this decade particularly if we shift from a system of years of extended learning to the system of life-long learning.

So I would like to give you a few admonitions which I hope we will keep in mind during the remaining deliberation. That we take the utmost care to assure that in solving some very real problems which the CEU, I think, does offer promise in solving, that at the same time we do not destroy the effectiveness of our non-controlled system of adult education. Notice I said non-controlled. I don't think it's uncontrolled but the system has been primarily a responsive system rather than a directed system. That we make sure that the CEU is an education facilitator rather than a mechanism for control. That it be a mechanism which facilitates institutional and societal change rather than one which creates further barriers to change. Adult and Continuing Education has been, in my analysis, a strong force for institutional change. Adult Educators and Extension Directors have been levers for change within their own institution because they have insisted upon the relevance of learning.

Let us be sure that in the solution of administrative problems, we do not do violence to the learning process. Solutions such as those we are proposing in our society usually endure long beyond their usefulness. There's always a danger that the measure becomes the standard. But the strength of Adult and Continuing Education in this country is that relevant learning has been the standard. As we proceed, I hope we will take care to see that it remains the standard.

Thank you.

DR. W. L. FLOWERS, VIRGINIA TECH

Earlier today you met our Dean, who is an adult educator in Virginia in his own right and has the credentials and the accomplishments to prove it. I should like to have you hear what he has to say and then he will introduce the next speaker.

DR. WILLIAM SKELTON, VIRGINIA TECH

Thank you very much, Dean Flowers. This year is our 100th birthday at Virginia Tech -- 1972. We feel like it is very significant to adult education to have you here with us at this particular time. We are very confident that this nation will show as much progress in the next hundred years as we have shown here in Virginia in our first hundred years. We would like to claim all of you as members of our State. I have tried to figure out how to do this. But last evening I was in Eastern Virginia and heard a fellow who I think solved my problem. He said that when Jamestown was settled in 1607, the first man on shore walked a little ways out of Jamestown and he said, "This is a great nation. Everything north of us is Northern Virginia and everything south is Southern Virginia and that includes Texas as well." On that basis we claim you as Virginians. We are glad to have you. We thought it would be very appropriate for the speakers to receive a medallion commemorating our centennial year here in appreciation to the tremendous effort that they are putting into this. I am very enthused about the conference, and I hope we will have many more.

It is my pleasure to present to you our Vice-president here at Virginia Tech for Academic Affairs. I need to define this so you can realize the very important position that he holds and the things that he can do to help make continuing education go, and he does. Our Extension Division and our Research Division, our Graduate School, all of our on-campus academic instruction -- report to this man. Or to turn it around, he is the man that tells us to get things moving, and we like it this way. He has a tremendous capacity for work, quality work, and to stimulate all those under him. So, when you talk about what goes on at Virginia Tech, this is the person you are talking about right here. Dr. Malpass has a very distinguished professional career. He was a psychologist at first at Onadogga County from New York (see, I pronounced that right) in the Child Guidance Center. I had a hard time when I went to Cornell University learning all these names, but I finally mastered it. Dr. Malpass was professor of psychology at Southern Illinois University; Visiting Professor, University of Florida; Professor and Chairman of Behavioral Sciences, University of South Florida; Post Doctorate Fellow in Academic Administration at the University of North Carolina and Stanford. Then we were very fortunate when he came to Virginia Tech in 1965 just as the University was beginning to grow and expand in scope and programs, and it was through his leadership that we came up with a new resource -- the College of Arts and Sciences, along with several new degree programs. In 1968 he became Vice-president for Academic Affairs. He has many honors for his distinguished work. In addition to all the work he does here on campus, he is very

active in community and church affairs, author of text books, and if any of you think you are pretty good in handball or tennis, you better not take him on because he is very good. So I give you our Vice-president of Academic Affairs, a person we hold in high respect, -- Dr. Malpass.

DR. L. F. MALPASS, VICE-PRESIDENT OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS, VIRGINIA TECH

We are happy to welcome you on this campus. There are about 13,200 students, approximately 1,200 faculty on campus, and about 700 professional extension workers associated with this University. The latter are located in 108 different offices across the State. We are tremendously proud of the commission that this land-grant university has gladly accepted. We are delighted with the kinds of credit activities that we can provide to students through June---60 undergraduate degree programs and 59 graduate programs, of which 31 now lead to a doctoral degree.

Most people have no idea that Virginia Tech, tucked away here in Blacksburg, has any kind of educational capability like that. Virginia Tech is Virginia's best kept secret. In addition to these credit activities, we are particularly proud of those educational activities that those 700 professionals involved in our extension and continuing education activities contribute to this State. This University, as Dean Skelton said, was founded just about 100 years ago. On October 1, 1872, five faculty members assembled in a hall that is still standing. They waited for several hours for the first student to wander through one of the doors. By the end of the first week, only 29 students had enrolled. Now, as we said, there are more than 13,200.

The statutes of the General Assembly of Virginia read that VPI was to provide education "in the practical arts for the masses of the Commonwealth." We are delighted with that kind of charge. We are proud of being a State University. A lot of people have a kind of self-consciousness when "State U-ism" is expressed. But we are happy to be a university where the average income of our student body is just slightly over the average family income in the nation. More than 5,000 of our undergraduate students are helped one way or another by scholarships, loans, or work-study programs to get through this University. On the other hand, if I tell you that the academic credentials that our students bring to this University are almost as good on the College Entrance Boards as those at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and that their grade average, in terms of their high school graduating class, is about the same as that University, you will see why we are proud of the quality of our students.

We are particularly proud that we do not keep our educational programs on this campus alone. There were 8,900 students who participated in non-credit educational programs through this facility last year. This year there will be better than 10,000 people, students, who will participate in non-credit activities. Better than one million people in the Commonwealth of Virginia this year have had face-to-face contact with educators from this institution.

There is a tremendous diversity of programs that the Extension - Continuing Education Division of this University promotes. There is a tremendous diversity in the constituency. More than 180,000 young people in this state alone had face-to-face contact with professional educators from this University. There are more than 2,000 individuals in this Commonwealth (in addition to the 13,200 on campus) who are enrolled in off-campus credit courses which lead to graduate degrees. One of the things that Dean Skelton and Dean Flowers have given particular concern to is off-campus credit courses. All these courses are offered only as part of a formal degree program which lead to one of 20 graduate degrees. These programs are growing by leaps and bounds.

I have been tremendously impressed as I have become familiar with Standard IX of the Southern Association. I think that this concept deserves a good deal of support. I feel strongly that, with the reliance in our society on symbols of achievement, the CEU can become a meaningful indicator of achievement. However, I have listened informally to some of the talk this afternoon and this evening, and I would hope that you people do not become so concerned with some of the "count" aspects of the CEU that you tend to lose contact with the concept itself. The concept can very easily catch on, can become very significant---not just for employers like Union Carbide; not just for people who work for the federal government; or others who can indicate on a more or less formal personnel record the kinds of contact hours the CEU may represent for them; not only for the kinds of people who are engaged in less formal activities (housewives, of course, like this kind of thing); but mainly because the CEU provides a reasonable index for a very reasonable kind of educational experience. As you can see, we heartily endorse the concept. We are glad that you are here, seriously considering it. We think that what the Southern Association has done is provide at least a reasonable starting point when it talks about 10 contact hours per CEU. Whether that is what you people will ultimately agree to is not so important as that the concept itself be the bridge over which many more people who are now engaged in formal but non-credit activities can be encouraged to concern themselves with less formal but very real education activities.

I am particularly impressed with the specification in Standard IX of quality standards for faculty, and I am personally delighted with the recommendation about advanced notice for programs and for the amount of CEU that might be given. I was delighted when I saw that the committee responsible for this concept had thought of independent study and study abroad, even foreign travel, as ways of achieving CEU credit; had thought of media exposure and other ways by which people could demonstrate realistic educational experience. These are the kinds of ideas which we here at Virginia Tech have espoused for some time and which readily gained our support.

This University is proud about blazing trails among American universities in building sequences of courses for our undergraduates that are very similar to course sequences for graduate students. We have, at both the lower division and the upper division, course sequences

which encourage students, freshman as well as seniors, to participate in formal research and independent study under the supervision of their professors, as well as in special projects. We permit our faculty, without the necessity of going through the formal approval mechanisms of curriculum committees, to experiment for two quarters with experimental courses of their own choosing with nothing more than the department head giving his approval for such courses. We have been experimenting for some time in our Upward Bound Program with a variety of non-credit experiences which can lead to formal credit work. Our Upward Bound students from the past six years have gone to universities from Florida to Vermont in part, I think, because of the quality of non-credit educational experiences which the Extension Division staff has provided to them. Many of our students today on this campus are participating in a variety of non-credit courses for which they would be delighted to receive some CEU credit on their transcript.

In short, you can see why we are enthused about the CEU concept. The CEU provides a defensible means for identifying non-credit educational activities and ought to be useful in a variety of ways to employers, to business and professional groups, to federal agencies, to sponsoring agencies, to state councils on higher education, but mostly as a means of motivating students themselves. Again, we are delighted to have you with us. We hope that you enjoy your stay here. One of the tests of your enjoyment here will be whether you come back to see us again. We hope you do--soon and often.

## Closing

DR. W. L. FLOWERS, VIRGINIA TECH

The Symposium tonight holds two treats in store for you. You have met both the gentlemen who are going to be the presenters here. Could we reconvene in the auditorium in about 15 minutes?

This group is adjourned.

Symposium I

OPENING - MR. JERRY HARGIS, CEC, VIRGINIA TECH

My name is Jerry Hargis. I have the singular pleasure of chairing this meeting. It is a pleasure to welcome you back for our first symposium. We are going to change the format on you just a bit, having two gentlemen speak in succession and holding your questions, if you will, until both gentlemen have made their presentations, and then we will quiz either of the gentlemen at your pleasure as long as you wish to stay and as long as they can defend themselves.

It is my distinct privilege to introduce two gentlemen whose work in Adult Education I have admired for some time. Our first speaker is Dr. Edgar J. Boone, who is head of the Department of Adult and Community College Education at North Carolina State University at Raleigh. Dr. Boone earned his Ph.D. in Adult Education from the University of Wisconsin a few years ago and he has been listed in Who's Who in the South - 1970-1971 edition, Who's Who in the United States or in America actually - 1971 edition, and he is President-elect of the Adult Education Association of the United States of America. But it is not really these things that I remember about Ed Boone. I recall things like the time he so graciously flew all night on an airplane, to help 70 young people who were trying to become adult educators for American Indians. After teaching a full day for them he turned right around and flew all night again to make a class back in Raleigh the following morning. He did that because he had the kind of dedication and the kind of sensitivities to the needs of adults that make him an outstanding leader in the field of Adult Education. So it is a great pleasure for me tonight to introduce a friend of mine and a good friend, and an outstanding colleague in the field of Adult Education -- Dr. Ed Boone

DR. ED BOONE, NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY, RALEIGH

Thank you very much, Jerry. I would like to say it is a real pleasure for me to be here this evening. I think it is very fitting that this conference be on the V.P.I. campus because I know of no other institution of higher education in the United States that is doing a better job in public service than this particular institution. You have a great staff and you certainly have a commitment to the job that needs to be done and you are doing the job well.

Public Service should be and can be the "hallmark" of higher education in the next two decades. Public service, in its broadest context, includes all educational programs and activities in which a concerted attempt is made to effectively relate the resources of higher education to the resolution of problems and issues confronting the people.

To develop my subject, I would like to invite you to think with me about three major points of emphasis, namely:

--A brief exploration of some of the contemporary trends affecting the social order;

--A brief exploration of the responsibility of higher education in response to these trends; and

--An exploration of some implications which the idea set forth holds for all of us who are engaged in higher education.

Never before has higher education been asked to respond to a larger number of diverse and seemingly unrelated problems, pressures, and publics. Any attempt to depict accurately the many problems of society, and the social setting within which continuing education currently operates, is limited by a lack of reliable information. However, there are some useful data that characterize certain aspects of our society and point up a few of the more critical problems confronting the American public. Many observers agree that strong forces for change are at work, both outside and inside institutions of higher education.

Outside the institutional setting a number of demographic trends are contributing significantly to our social setting. A look at these trends reveals first a population described by several characteristics, namely: increasing heterogeneity, urbanization, mobility, mortality, and education. What are the manifestations of these trends?

The United States has been labeled a "nation of nations." This connotation has been earned because of its high degree of ethnic and racial heterogeneity, as well as important regional differences.

Successive deposits of population have created a multicultural and multiracial society in which nearly every nationality, race, and creed is represented. Further, if the population explosion continues at its current rate, there will be 280 million people in the United States by 1980. At the present time, about 50 percent of our population is under 25, and over 65. By 1980, it is expected that 50 percent of our population will be under 21, and over 65. Thus, the American population is becoming characterized as "younger and older."

Another significant characteristic of our population is that it is now largely urbanized and becoming increasingly so. From a nation characterized in the 1800s as predominantly agricultural with 95 percent of the population classified as rural, we have become a nation of urban dwellers with over 70 percent living in urban areas. One indicator of urbanization is reflected in the rapid change in the character of the labor force. In 1900, 38 percent of the labor force was in farming. By 1967, this figure had dropped to 5 percent, and by 1980 is expected to decrease to less than 4 percent. Advancements in technology have freed increasing numbers of our rural population, who have moved to metropolitan areas to find jobs and to make a new life.

The greatest increases in population have occurred in metropolitan areas. While central cities were the first source of attraction during our early growth into an urban society, the more recent trend is toward suburban living. By 1980, it is expected that about 80 percent of our population will be living in metropolitan suburban minorities, the aged, the disadvantaged, and other lower working class groups. The suburbs are populated by the white middle and upper working classes. Discrimination has become a dominant factor in the slow growth of racial minorities in suburban areas. Core cities have declined in population due to the rapid exodus of the white population to suburban areas.

What consequences to society may arise as a result of these patterns of urban growth? A trend may be developing toward separating subcultures along racial lines, thus creating tension, conflict, and disruption arising from frustration, lack of opportunity, and prejudice against social groups. Urbanism also brings increased educational opportunities and use of mass media. Other generalizations that may be made about urbanism is that it promotes greater tolerance and diversity, less religious observance, less stability, higher educational attainment, more mental illness, higher crime rates, more rapid social change, and greater freedom.

Another characteristic unique to our population is its high rate of mobility. It is estimated that 20 percent of the people change communities each year, in addition to those who change residences within a given community. Men are more mobile than women and nonwhites more likely to move than whites. The rate of mobility tends to decrease as age increases. A highly mobile society has a number of implications; that is, mobility may:

--Result in erratic behavior and social disorganization;

--Weaken traditional forms of social control;

--Reduce the opportunity to develop community spirit; and

--Tend to emphasize the social problems that can be identified in cities.

Conversely, mobility may also stimulate intellectual development and contribute to the rise of nonconformity, since behavior norms are retained in the movement from one community to another. In such conditions, norms lose their sanctions and tolerance of nonconformity develops. It may be truly said of our modern society that a large proportion of the people are not anchored to "hearth and home" in its traditional sense.

Characteristic of our population, also, is its relatively high proportion of married persons. There are 96 males for every 100 females. In the ratio of men-to-women, men predominate until age 25; thereafter, the ratio is higher for women. In the year 1900, 59 percent of males and 67 percent of females were married. These percentages jumped to 75 percent for males and 81 percent for females in 1970, and the trend continues upward.

In addition to this trend, the character of the family and role of its members have changed. With the growth of urbanization, new functions have arisen and many traditional functions have been taken over by other institutions in the community. Since 1900, there has been a 50 percent increase in the proportion of maleless households because of the higher survival rate of females--a trend which is expected to continue on the increase. The growth in population in the over-65 group is largely due to women outliving their husbands, thereby creating another kind of social problem.

Life expectancy in the United States continues to climb. People are living longer, thanks to the high level of medical care, sanitation, and standards of living. Life expectancy at birth in 1900 was 47 years; in 1965, about 70 years. By 1980 it is expected to reach 75 years.

The formal educational level of our population continues to rise. Currently, the median educational level is about 11 years of schooling. Women continue to have higher median educational attainment than men, although more men complete four or more years of college. Another important factor is that the number of college graduates 25 years of age and older is expected to increase from less than 10 million in 1968 to about 20 million by 1985.

Our labor force continues to grow in relation to the rising population, increase in productivity, and the expansion of our gross national product. The present labor force exceeds the 81 million mark as compared to 22 million in 1890. Important among

this growth has been the rapid increase in white-collar jobs. Projected trends indicate a continuing expansion in these occupations due to increasing technology and automation; the growing bureaucracy in industry, business, and government; and the growth of professional occupations. Ours is the first industrial society whose labor force is not dominated by blue-collar occupations. The greatest increases among the occupational groupings over the past 10 years have occurred in the professional, technical, and service worker segments of our labor force. Second in order of growth are the clerical and associated groups.

Another significant trend in today's labor force is the increasing number of women entering the world of work. The trend is expected to continue in this direction by nearly half a million a year. Some women are working for self-fulfillment, but economic reasons are the most dominant ones. Another basic reason appears to be the perceived need to maintain a standard of living desired by the family. Over half of the women in the labor force are married.

These trends may be summarized by saying:

--Our population will continue to grow at an accelerating rate;

--There will be more younger and older people;

--People will continue to move to metropolitan areas;

--People will move more frequently;

--Family units will continue to increase;

--Life expectancy will increase;

--More people will attend school for a greater number of years as the growing importance of education emerges as a major economic factor;

--Fewer workers will be required for unskilled, manufacturing, and agricultural jobs and more for service and professional work;

--The number of women in the labor force will continue to grow as the world of work adjusts to the new federal mandates of equal opportunity; and

--Fewer work hours, longer vacations, shifts in jobs, and earlier retirement may be expected in our modern-day labor force.

A number of other factors are also contributing significantly to our social setting. Some are more important and pressing for solutions than others. While the problems of population crisis, race, the aged,

poverty, youth, the generation gap, crime, alienation, mental illness, the economy, city conditions, and war and peace loom high, other issues such as drug addiction, alcoholism, pollution of the environment, family disorganization, changing social values, the domination of the mass media by advertisers, and--above all--the individual amidst all these social trends point up serious issues in our modern society that will command attention from many sources. Since time will not permit the pursuit of each of these, I shall comment briefly on but a few.

Our society is increasingly characterized by a conflict in values emphasized by a growing generation gap, a lack of integration among institutions and groups, the continuing failure of many institutions to deal with their problems, and the existence of widespread social differences--and levels of inequality. The pockets of poverty that exist within this country indicate that segments of our population have not been fully integrated into the mainstream of society. Minorities and some working class people are subject to many disadvantages which their roots in discriminatory practices, inferior education, and particular occupational distribution that reflects inferior status and limited opportunity. All citizens have not shared equally in the benefits available to an affluent society. Some segments of the population are still heavily concentrated in low-paying and unskilled jobs. Where pockets of poverty exist, a sense of relevance as human beings is lacking. While economic, political, social, and educational dimensions must be components of any approach to this problem, all of these aspects must build upon the central problem of enlarging human values and self-concepts and the development of new motivations. A focus on building greater humanization into our society is needed to induce more people to work together to improve the quality of living for all Americans.

Business, industry, the professions, and life itself have all been profoundly affected by technological changes. The phenomenal growth (expansion) in knowledge and research findings is almost unbelievable. Levels of training required for workers to take and retain their places in the occupational structure have been considerably elevated. Labor-saving devices and especially automation have rapidly increased the amount of leisure time. Yet, we also have found technological innovations to be responsible, in part, for the emerging problems of air, land, and water pollution. Now, a word about the individual amidst all these social trends. The rapidity of social change has been a major source of alienation for the individual. The symptoms of alientation and powerlessness--that is, distrust, anger, cynicism, a cult of the present, and a need for immediate gratification--permeate all levels of society. New social patterns and trends have provided multiple statuses and roles for each individual, and often involve frustrating conflicts. Changing values in the "Great Society" have made it difficult for the individual to keep his social morings. The behavior of many individuals today may be, in fact a reflection of a culture and social structure that has failed to provide them with sufficiently clear guidelines and high predictability for interpersonal relations. Hence, when the social situation is not clearly defined for its members, social adjustments become difficult to master. Much more needs to be said here, but we must move to our next question, or point of emphasis.

What is the role of education in responding to the trends which I have identified for you? What should be the major thrusts of our educational institutions in a modern world, engulfed with so many problems and issues commanding attention?

Much has been written about higher education's role in continuing education. While there is indeed no specific agreement, there also appears to be little disagreement. Rather, the differences seem to focus on the emphasis that should be placed on "functions" to be performed. Higher education cannot be all things to all people. Hence, it cannot assume the mission of solving all problems for all segments of society. However, the traditional patterns of higher education clearly will be inadequate for the future needs of our society. We need to decide what is our "cup of tea," and move now on the problems already upon us. To do this, there must be a breakaway from the more traditional patterns of organization, programs, and thinking about higher education. Forward-looking educators are beginning to recognize that the future success of colleges and universities depends upon the acceptance of the idea that higher education is a much larger part of the whole social pattern than we have formerly believed it to be. The thrusts of higher education are being examined from all levels of today's society--that is, local, state, and national. Many educators and laymen are saying the need is for a flexible system of higher education, with concrete plans for relating its resources to the problems and needs of society. Implied in this belief is a genuine commitment on the part of higher education to lead the way in the development of a better life for all. To this end, higher education's role in continuing education is a vital and dynamic element and function. This leads to another very important point--that of examining the <u>real</u> functions set forth for higher education.

If we look at the three major functions of higher education, we find them to be <u>research</u>, <u>teaching</u>, and <u>service</u>. In the past, much emphasis has been placed on the first two functions, and a great deal of "lip service" given to the third function--"service."

Much of the criticism surrounding higher education is emanating from its lack of emphasis on the "service" function and is directed toward the concepts of "relevance" and "flexibility." A decade ago, higher education was held in high esteem by national leaders and the American public in general. Today, people are growing increasingly impatient with higher educations' approaches to current problems and are frustrated by its slowness to change and to participate actively in finding solutions. Indeed, the answer could be that we are not finding solutions fast enough. In our efforts to meet the needs of a complex society, remarkable progress has been made in new techniques of teaching and learning. We have proliferated courses and programs to meet new demands and provided new public services of many kinds. Yet, we have concentrated our efforts on maintaining the traditional concept of formal education and have given insufficient attention to the real needs of the society that sustains us.

Both the Carnegie Commission reports on higher education and the more recent Newman Report stress the need for greater flexibility in higher education. Strong emphasis is given to allowing re-entry to education at periods throughout life and to further exploration of the so-called "university without walls," which places emphasis on independent study and courses at home, place of work, or in a community center. Much has been said about the failure of higher education to educate for constructive employment, responsible citizenship, and creative enjoyment.

Higher education and governmental agencies have been quite successful in providing science and technology for the solution of individual problems that require individual decisions. However, when solutions to problems require group decisions, the fruits of their research, knowledge, and skill seem to falter, or the "lag time" is too great between need and accomplishment. Thus, the need to re-examine our academic mission and goals and re-order priorities is upon us. Colleges and universities, if they expect to survive as viable and creative institutions in our society, must place equal emphasis on the "public service" function. The service function must not be isolated from the regular academic and research programs, but must feed into and enrich them by making them more relevant. It is time to stop thinking of continuing education as an incidental appendage to formal studies and to look at it in terms of what it should actually become--an essential and increasingly important part of the total higher education process.

There is no doubt in my mind that, in the near future, we shall see rapid and consistent growth of the concept that education is indeed a life-long process, and that all education must be continuing education. Higher education must take the initiative in setting the pattern and leading the way toward this way of thinking.

Moreover, it appears that higher education must become increasingly involved in providing a variety of public services directly related to the solution of the larger and complex problems of modern life. Institutions of higher education may serve as coordinating forces in bringing together other agencies and institutions in the development of programs and services focused at meeting the needs of the changing social patterns at local, state, and national levels. What other institutions in our society are as ideally fitted to provide new and broader leadership in seeking solutions to community and social problems? Institutions of higher education, in their traditional roles of innovator, teacher, educational adviser, disseminator of information, and source of knowledge have, for the most part, refrained from participating in the decision-making processes of the community. The extent to which colleges and universities should take the risk of being involved in community-based decision-making is a critical issue of our times, and one that deserves the closest attention of our leaders.

I believe that institutions of higher education must become both catalysts and coordinating agencies in bringing together the resources of many diverse groups and agencies, as well as their own. They must:

--Provide leadership in encouraging cooperation among the many agencies to help solve the dilemmas of modern life;

--Make effective use of results of both basic and applied research in seeking solutions to societal problems;

--Develop new techniques for problem-solving, and apply existing techniques--such as systems analysis--to community and social problems;

--Invent new methods and delivery systems for the distribution and transfer of information to our publics;

--Analyze the needs for continuing education and public service, and educate professionals in effectively meeting these needs; and

--Develop programs for the continual updating of professionals in all fields.

In short, they must provide interdisciplinary, integrated, and systematic approaches to complex community problems by focusing on them all of their intellectual and technical resources.

In this type of mission, the educational institution becomes a "total institution" with a "total education" thrust and views its place in society in a new light. The public service function of higher education may be the vehicle through which it can test new ideas, new and innovative projects which can have meaning both for the changing curricula throughout the institution and problem-solving in the community. For this to become a reality, there must be a "total commitment" to the concept of public service on the part of faculty and staff.

Thus, the formulation of a satisfactory philosophy of public service for higher education is a task that must be resolved--and this is one of the most difficult assignments facing higher education today. Quoting from a report by the trustees of the Carnegie Foundation:

> On the one hand, the University must remain faithful to its highest ideal, the pursuit of learning; on the other, it must be responsive to the legitimate needs of the society that sustains it. Furthermore, it has a responsibility to make that society a better society.

Extending the resources of the campus to individuals and groups who are not a part of the regular academic community, and bringing an academic institution's special competence to bear on the solution of

society's problems, will contribute to the maintenance of institutional integrity and relevance. Evidence of renewed support for higher education has been reinforced through recent federal and state legislation that provided funds to universities for public service programs.

Our focus has been that of characterizing the American scene, with particular emphasis upon the dynamics of our society and the future role of higher education in directing social and economic change. In my concluding remarks, I would like to share with you some implications, as I perceive them, for higher education.

--Higher education must acquire an understanding of and sensitivity to the needs of its environment and, more specifically, its publics; (No longer can institutions of higher learning view their public as the campus-based student body.)

--Higher education must become thoroughly committed to "public service" as one of its most important functions. This commitment must extend from the top level of the organization to the lowest level; (It must be more than lip service. It must be reflected in staffing, urban struction, and funding.)

--Alternative approaches to financing the public service function of higher education must be fully explored, and an appropriate plan must be devised to assure adequate financing of this function. Careful scrutiny must be given to the current utilization of resources that are available to higher education. Legislators and relevant others who determine the financial bases for higher education must be helped to understand the importance of the public service function;

--Higher education must be restructured so as to reflect and facilitate implementation of the public service function, with equal emphasis given public service as that accorded resident teaching and research;

--Higher education must accept as one of its major responsibilities that of developing and maintaining effective professional education programs designed to equip personnel to provide leadership roles for the public service function; (The traditional academician and researcher are not equipped or committed to provide leadership for public service programs.)

--Public service programs must have their origin in the analyzed and perceived needs of people. The identification of such needs will require collaborative efforts by both higher education personnel and leaders of the various publics at all levels.

--It is envisoned that an outstanding public service program would encompass a multitude of learning activities, beginning with the individual and community problem-oriented programs and extending to highly formalized, nontechnical, professional education programs.

--Public service programs of higher education should not be isolated from the regular academic and research programs, but should feed into resident teaching and research. Indeed, public service programs should become the major source for renewing and making more relevant the teaching and research functions.

--Professionals engaged in the public service functions of higher education must be accorded the same status and rewards as those ascribed to their peers in teaching and research;

--Institutions of higher education must continually strive to establish and maintain alliances and effective working relationships with sister institutions in contiguous areas--community colleges, state agencies, and other organized groups whose primary mission is education. Such linkages cannot be forged and maintained on the campuses of institutions of higher education. Rather, public service faculty in institutions of higher education must be amenable to working with the leaders of such groups within their institutional and situational context.

--Higher education must maintain a continuous evaluation of its public service programs. Results that accrue from these evaluations should be utilized as bases for strengthening and redirecting existing programs. Further, these findings should be used in making decisions about new programs to serve the needs of our many publics.

Through the years, higher education in America has experienced many trends, some of which eventually became popular slogans. For example, there was Publish or Perish, one which we all remember and to which many of us still adhere; then, there was Research Regardless, one that followed World War II. Today, there is Teach or Terminate--a movement that has not yet fully matured. I propose another for your consideration, that is, Service for Survival.

I believe very sincerely my friends, that the future of higher education rests with the public service function, and I truly hope that our leaders in higher education will awaken to this tremendous challenge and develop the programs that publics certainly need and merit.

INTRODUCTION OF DEAN ANDRE DE PORRY BY MR. JERRY HARGIS

Thank you, Dr. Boone.

To assist in the next introduction, I am going to follow the gentleman's wishes who wrote me a brief letter last week.

Dean Andre de Porry studied abroad and was in the Foreign Service for awhile and the service of our country. He is Dean of the School of General Studies at the University of Virginia; he has served on the Advisory Committee for the revision of Standard IX of the Southern Association; and he has worked very closely with the people in the Southern Association. Long before coming to the Commonwealth of Virginia and long before coming to the State of Virginia, I had heard the name of Andre de Porry. I think one of the most significant things that you would want to know about Andre de Porry is the fact that last year his professional colleagues in the State of Virginia in the Adult Education Association of Virginia awarded him their highest honor, the Curt Snyder Award--the award in this state for outstanding service to the profession of Adult Education. I would like to quote for you a brief sentence from Andre's letter to me that I received last week. He said when he started, "I prefer short introductions." He said, "If you have to say anything about me, say that I am a fellow that has hung around the profession for a while and might have a few comments to make on it." Well, with his characteristic modesty and his vantage point of years of experience and insight and the intellectual power that has made the extension and continuing education program at the University of Virginia an outstanding example of what public service can be, it is a great pleasure for me to present to you to share some thoughts this evening, Dean Andre de Porry on the topic of what the Continuing Education Unit is going to mean to universities.

Dean de Porry ---

DEAN ANDRE DE PORRY, UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

For the better part of the present century, and especially in recent years, the philosophy of education which is summed up most aptly in the term "continuing education," has been bidding for recognition as a conceptual framework in the educational process which is inherently logical, truly viable, and critically necessary to these times. Embodied in this philosophy are a variety of concepts, based on the principle that it is a fundamental error to think of education as being completed at an early time in the life span. Education must be as long as life, because the needs for learning are the needs of a lifetime. Continuing education is a process eminently suited to the purposes and capabilities of adults, and as necessary to these ends for the good of society as for the well being of the individual.

The National Advisory Council on Adult Education, in its report just made to the President, highlights this for national attention together with a recommendation for a Bicentennial Year White House Conference on Adult Education in 1976. "Adult Education can no longer be the stepchild of our educational system," the Council warns. "Adults, not children, are making the decisions that affect all functions and actions of our government" - and so on, in language too familiar to require repetition for this audience.

As we hear others saying these things, and saying them with conviction, we sense that we have reached in the closing decades of this century, a time of recognition for continuing education. On every side opportunities for adults to move ahead with their learning are being broadened and increased. This is especially evident in the number and variety of off-campus degree programs being developed by colleges and universities throughout the United States and abroad.

But it is important to note for the context of our discussion that implementation of the philosophy of continuing education is only partially fulfilled in the expanding opportunity for individuals to complete degree programs without being physically in residence in colleges and universities. Off-campus or special degree programs, important as they are in our credential - oriented society, and meaningful as they are for what they do contribute to the individual, are not enough. They are not enough because they are only one kind of a building block in a true system of lifelong learning. A degree program is a package representing a body of educational achievement bearing the warranty stamp of the institution providing it. With all its virtues it has a terminal character. What could be more expressive of finality than the traditional graduation exercise, with its ornamented diploma, and with the flat mortarboard which appears to symbolize that a cap has been placed on the learning of the recipient.

As adult educators, we have no fundamental quarrel with the degree concept, and we share in promoting it however we can. But at the same time we do have certain misgivings because, on the one hand, it is too

often the case that the eye is on the package rather than on its contents, and, on the other hand, that it can, unless placed in perspective, become a blockage in the arterial flow of lifelong learning.

Continuing education, in the definition of its essence which has taken shape over the years, is first of all a process which needs to go on in pace with the life of the individual, varying with his changing needs. Its focus, if it is to be true to its role, will be on the learning and on the purpose to be served at the point of time for the participant in the activity.

It is to serve these objectives that the continuing education program of colleges and universities include a vast array of offerings which are not classified among the credit courses applicable to a degree. So-called non-credit courses, institutes, workshops, seminars - the nomenclature is extensive - provide a whole range of educational experiences to round out a necessary dimension of higher education. Flexible in design and format, they can be tailored to immediate need, getting right to the business of the learning desired by the adult student. Certainly, courses for credit may do the same thing, and some will say do it better, but in general, credit builds toward the degree and tends to follow a certain pattern or sequence. The non-credit offering looks to the immediate task at hand, and as such has much to offer both individuals and employers interested in education which is relevant to pressing need.

The growing acceptance of such offerings suggests that we are on the threshold of opportunity to achieve something of a breakthrough in understanding and support with regard to the true role of continuing education. It is in this connection that the development of the continuing education unit is such a welcome event in higher education, and all the more so because it has been moved into the national spotlight by being endorsed and adopted by one of the five regional accrediting associations of the United States - the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

By setting up a system for the orderly development of certain phases of continuing education which are apart from the academic credit structure, the continuing education unit has the potential for doing what is needed. It offers form to the substance of a segment of higher education which is of much importance but which, we must admit, has been following a disorganized pattern and which can stand much improvement. It holds a number of implications for continuing university education.

Perhaps foremost, the c.e. unit provides a framework for the presentation of non-credit work to give it status as a respected partner with academic credit courses in the enterprise of higher education. The formula has the merit of logical simplicity and adaptability to any format. One continuing education unit represents ten contact hours in an organized continuing education experience under responsible sponsorship, capable direction and qualified instruction. The definition itself sets up criteria which are not only quantitative but also qualitative in a way to confer responsibility upon the institution. The college or university which attaches its name to the issuance of the continuing education unit

affirms, on the basis of its integrity, that what it says happened actually did take place. The unit thus becomes a kind of warranty and as such can be accepted as a thing of value, different in character from academic credit but not necessarily less excellent in terms of its own meaning. The net result can be to give non-credit education a better place in the sun - more impressive to academic community, student, and employer, and better positioned to claim financial support from local, state, and Federal sources.

An institution undertaking to adopt the c.e. unit - and for the Southern Association region this means all institutions offering non-credit work - will immediately need to begin doing certain things. The continuing education division will re-examine its range of non-credit offerings, evaluating them in relation to the criteria for the continuing education unit. In doing this it may well wish to study the classification system designed at the University of Georgia, and described by C. B. Lord in his timely article on "A Classification System for Continuing Education Programs," in Adult Leadership for April. An orderly, yet flexible, system of this kind can prove most useful.

In developing non-credit programs, some divisions of continuing education solicit the same academic approval for non-credit courses and instructors as for credit courses, and others do not. If approval is a requirement, it is a form of quality control which can be useful, although if too narrowly applied it can also be limiting. Institutional policy in this respect involves academic decisions in which the faculty of the institution will necessarily be involved. Whatever formulae are adopted by various institutions for management of the new system, the process of re-examination will be strengthening and is to be welcomed. It should lead to the weeding out of programs which the institution cannot well relate to its resources, or which should more appropriately be offered by a different kind of institution.

There are other policy matters to be faced by the institution, and by the state when continuing education has state financial support. Full-time equivalent standards for students in non-credit programs need to be established, and a system for recording units in the official student records of the institution must be devised. These exercises, however painful to faculty and administrative committees, registrars, data processing, and fiscal officers, will serve a useful purpose for the continuing education division and its clients by the focus of attention which the institution itself will be required to devote to its non-credit offerings. This may help to bring continuing education closer to the central concerns of the institution - a consummation devoutly to be wished.

There are some risks to be run here, however. There has been a certain advantage for the continuing education division in the freedom it has enjoyed in the development of non-credit programs. There are experimental approaches which result in exciting and innovative adventures in learning - or which may prove to be unhappy failures. There is some danger that a c.e. unit system may be an inhibiting influence on the

programmer. The administrative requirements set forth in the interim statement of The National Task Force appear to allow for programs to be offered without the unit. It will be unfortunate if an institution in defining its policies does not permit reasonable programming latitude for its continuing education division. The handbook for the full use of the c.e. unit now under preparation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and the Task Force will supply helpful guidelines for the utilization of the c.e. unit system by member institutions.

The continuing education unit needs to be recognized for what it is as well as for what it is not. It makes its contribution by providing affirmation that an educational activity has been carefully planned and responsibly administered under qualified instruction. It testifies that there has been some evaluation of the student's performance - whether this be by regular attendance and alert participation in discussion, by a written summary of new knowledge or perceptions attained, or by formal examination, or some other device. The course or seminar can be of short duration and still have the substance of a quality offering which is identifiable and measurable, although not of the duration or structure of the academic credit course. The continuing education unit thus offers the means of measurement and the assurance of an acceptable standard of performance by the participant. These quality controls will improve the image of continuing education not for credit, and may even rid us of the expression, "non-credit," which is sometimes used in a derogatory manner to indicate a low level of academic citizenship. The c.e. unit approach will serve the interests of the institution for its reputation, and of the employer who may be paying the fee. So far as excellence of offering and student performance are concerned, the c.e. unit will be a means of underscoring the quality, and giving status in the academic and public eye, for what our institutions have been doing in the non-credit field, and which has not had sufficient recognition. Every administrator of continuing education programs knows that the adult student is generally the best motivated of all students. He responds well to good instruction. He will learn if exposed to a good learning environment. In reality the adult student is about the best quality control instrument we have. If the instruction is not good he will quickly signify his displeasure by his absence, or if this is not feasible by strong and unfriendly remarks. Sad experience has taught us that continuing education programs wilt under mediocrity. While we in the profession have a sense of merit for what we do, however, we do have a problem in convincing some others - not all, by any means - that our batting average, while never 1,000 is still pretty good. The c.e. unit will help mightily in this respect.

One tangible and important benefit of the c.e. unit plan is the attraction it offers to adults to participate in continuing education courses and programs. The system can also be a most effective way of influencing the individual to make a commitment to lifelong learning, and to understand the larger dimension of education beyond the college degree, graduate as well as undergraduate.

As the system is established nationally, this is what we can say to the adult however we can reach him: "Here is a plan which you can adopt and shape for yourself and continue with through life, if you wish. Whenever you take one of these organized programs you will receive a unit for each 10 contact hours of instruction, or a decimal portion of a unit for a shorter activity. You can build these units as you do a bank account, to stand beside your college degree, if you have one, but to meet your special needs for education whether you have a degree or not. The university (or college) stands behind this unit. Your employer will value it because it can tell him how you are improving yourself and updating yourself for your occupation. If you change jobs it will help you in finding other employment."

This is indeed a persuasive line of approach. It will be more so if the adult student can have a record of his continuing education units which he can keep, add to as he wishes, present to others, and satisfy incidentally the collector's instinct which is strong with most of us.

It has been noted that the continuing education units earned by students are to become part of the institutional record, available always to be communicated as evidence of student performance, on the same principle as college credits. We can hope, however, that the c.e. unit system can avoid the defects of the college transcript, which lacks much in being a good instrument of communication.

I understand that thought is being given to the establishment of a national data bank to become a storehouse of c.e. unit records which can readily be made available. This would have advantages but there would always be the problem of time lag between course completion and getting information into and out of the data bank. Institutions are not famous for promptness in such matters. Nor would the information be sufficient in telling what the course or program actually contained. If this has to be solicited by correspondence, the problem will only be compounded.

Another plan suggests itself which would mean more to the student, be useful to the employer, and at the same time contribute to the national identity of the continuing education unit system. Let us assume that the National Task Force on the Continuing Education Unit designs a uniform type of certificate of a size to fit a letter envelope, with pre-punched holes in one end so it can be placed in a loose binder of the same size - an item which could also be designed and become a neat sale item to help with expenses. Actual certificates following the national design format would be printed by individual institutions to bear their own name, and such other information as might be required. At the bottom of each certificate there would be a statement that X institution is a member of the national association and that its continuing education unit courses meet the criteria of national standards.

Under this system a student, upon satisfactory completion of a course, could be given a uniform certificate testifying that he has earned so-many c.e. units for participation in the named activity and

that this certificate is evidence of the official record preserved by the institution. To make the certificate more useful, there might be reproduced on the reverse side a paragraph describing in brief but sufficient detail the substance of the activity for which c.e. units have been awarded.

There would be practical advantages to such a system. The student would have something he could preserve and be proud of. He could immediately show it to his employer, who could make a reproduction for his own records. Wherever and however often the adult student may change his place of residence, or however he may shift from one institutional program to another, he would always receive the same basic kind of certificate. Because of the uniformity of the continuing education unit measurement there would never be quantitative confusion. Qualitatively the institutions would be protected as their offerings would be identified as their own. The time saved in correspondence would be immeasurable.

Undoubtedly, if some such system could be given practical application, the motivational effect on the student, or prospective student, would be strong. Continuing education unit certificates could be accumulated like saving certificates - in this case a lifelong bank of knowledge. The benefit of continuous learning would be promoted by the visible building of a record of achievement. In order to stimulate this, the inside covers of the binder holding the certificate could provide useful information to the student about the continuing education unit and its meaning, and put in a good word also for the principle of lifelong learning. Finally, the system, as well as the unit approach, lends itself to good national publicity.

The continuing education unit will tend to be used for courses and other programs which are occupationally oriented, and it is well adapted to such activities. Training and re-training courses which do not fit comfortably into the credit structure, institute programs for business and professional groups, executive management seminars, organized programs for federal, state and local government personnel - the number and variety of such programs is almost infinite, and all of which can readily meet the criteria defined by the National Task Force for the continuing education unit. The system also has much to offer business and professional associations for the development, with and through institutions of higher education, of continuing education programs for certification and re-certification. Here is an opportunity to build well-structured programs for the continuing up-dating of people in the world of work, especially those who already have the degrees, or for whom the degree route is not practicable. The military services should find many ways in which the system can be useful to their very special needs.

The application of the c.e. unit in the foregoing cases, and others which I feel sure I have neglected to mention, is clear and logical. In defined areas related to occupational needs the role for the unit is visible, and the sooner we can get on with it, the better.

And certainly if we are to claim institutional or state financial support for the instruction of students outside the credit structure, this is the place to start. It is a sound basis on which to approach the matter of institutional and state criteria for the offering of the continuing education unit.

Continuing education, with its philosophy of lifelong learning to meet the needs of time and change, has no difficulty in articulating a rationale for the place and importance of all its activities. Pre-retirement as well as post-retirement programs, education for the more creative use of leisure time, continuing education for women, citizenship education, and broad liberal education - these can all be described as valid and as worthy of support as programs related directly to job or profession. The impulse is to say that all these should be included.

But aside from the problem of winning financial support for the c.e. unit, which if it can be done at all will most readily be accomplished for programs to improve employment skills, there is a question whether the continuing education unit should, in fact, be extended to include all non-credit offerings.

My own thinking is that it should not. There should be an area of continuing education remaining entirely free and fluid, the captive of no system or computer, subservient to no social security number. To say this does not, I believe, quarrel with the National Task Force, for its definition of criteria excludes the unstructured program, the general conference, the discussion seminar, and similar activities which may be highly educational but do not follow an organized pattern of instruction.

The point is worth making, however, because there are adults to whom the form and the number are anathema, who will not participate in programs in which performance is to be measured, because they have neither interest nor need to be measured or evaluated. Their motivation is education for its own sake, not for units, points, or credits. We need to reserve a place in our program for them.

There needs to be room, also, for programs which are new in concept and approach and which have to be tried out to see if they work, and whether or how they might fit into the organized structure. All of which, I suppose, is a way of saying that as we move forward to bring better order to much of what we are doing, the frontier should always be open and free. In developing and adopting the continuing education unit for non-credit work here could be a tendency, especially if financial support is provided for it, to confine activities to what meets the standard for the unit. This would be unfortunate. Continuing education, to borrow a few words from Thomas Jefferson, must as all education be forever dedicated to the "illimitable freedom of the human mind." For our purposes we apply the work freedom to the liberation of men and women from ignorance.

Michael Marien, research fellow at Syracuse University, in an article entitled "Higher Learning in the Ignorant Society," which appears in The Futurist for April, says that "our learning needs are rapidly outdistancing our attainments . . . we are becoming a threat to national - or even global - survival." Mr. Marien's warning is echoed in too many ways by others who study the trends of society not to be taken to heart, especially by continuing education. The contemporary emphasis on career education, the needs for massive infusion of practical knowledge, important as they are, must not cloud our vision of the larger dimension of education which looks to the deeper cultivation of the human mind. We must not forget this as the ultimate challenge.

In these perspectives university continuing education can heartily embrace the continuing education unit as an important part of the whole, and a helpful means to an end. We can see it also as a way to attract many additional thousands into the pathways of continuing education, with the good hope that, as they are brought to the fountains of learning, they will find the waters sweet to the taste.

Group Discussion

MR. JERRY HARGIS, CEC, VIRGINIA TECH

Thank you, Dean de Porry.

I am sure that our two gentlemen who have spoken this evening have provoked questions in your minds and we are going to give you the opportunity to quiz them about your thoughts.

T. J. PINNOCK, TUSKEGEE INSTITUTE

Dean, I have some concerns based on your presentation. There is a hazy area in my mind as far as the Continuing Education Unit is concerned. One, to what extent have industries throughout the United States been informed of the Continuing Education Unit and the attempt to upgrade people throughout the country or to broaden education for all? That is one of my concerns. My next concern is probably related very much to what Mr. Delker dealt with this afternoon. Could it not become highly restrictive within a society that moves toward Continuing Education Units when one state for example accepts it very well, moves to implement it and another state for example says, "No, I do not see the value of it."?

DEAN ANDRE DE PORRY, UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

In reference to your first comment or question, I can say that the Continuing Education Unit is still very new. It is new in the academic community, in higher education, continuing education, and probably has not been heard to a large extent in industry, except by those who may have had participation in the work of the National Task Force. I believe that the establishment of a national image for the Continuing Education Unit will certainly contribute to its acceptance and to an understanding of what it plans to do. I tried to make some suggestions in that direction. I share your concerns about the possible rigidity of the unit, and I think I was echoing what Paul Delker said at dinner this evening -- that we need to be very careful in how we manage the system and develop the system for utmost efficiency. The acceptance from one state to another, I think, will come as the various accrediting associations begin to take up the Continuing Education Unit as the Southern Association has done. I understand that all the regional accrediting associations are watching what is happening in the Southern Association very carefully, and they will in all likelihood follow in his path if what it does is good. Institutions of higher education through their own national association are ready, I think, for this kind of concept. The adoption of a national kind of certification, in accordance with the suggestion I have offered, will contribute greatly to the university acceptance throughout the United States.

JOHN MAPP, RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

Andre, you weren't in your system necessarily ruling out the national system, if I understand you correctly. You could combine the two, could you not, with maybe a third copy going to the national?

DEAN ANDRE DE PORRY, UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

I think you certainly could and my suggestion is only one of many which I am sure will come to the National Task Force, but I fear the expense -- the sheer job of setting up this kind of a national data bank. It is not easily done. The other system I think can be established more quickly. It is practical and it can be immediately useful. It does not necessarily rule out the national data bank, and I am certainly not saying that the national data might be better. It is just the thought.

RUITH HEINEMANN, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

I have one question and one comment. Dr. de Porry, what was the name of the article and the author that you quoted at the end of your presentation? Higher Learning for the Ignorant?

DEAN ANDRE DE PORRY, UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

This was a re-statement of a paper that was delivered at the National Convention of the Society of the Future (Future Society). The name is Michael Marien. The title of the article is "Higher Learning in the Ignorant Society;" the periodical, The Futurist, April 1972. It is a very excellent article.

RUITH HEINEMANN, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

Thank you. The other matter that is on my mind I hate to state because of the hour, but I find myself somewhat disturbed by the comments made this evening about the dereliction of higher education institutions in the matter of continuing education. I think that this is somewhat of an unjust criticism partly in view of the history of extension divisions in agriculture; partly in view of the role of industry in the development of higher education institutions in probably the last 10 years. Places like the University of Minnesota have worked closely with Minnesota Mining, with Honeywell, in the development of their engineering programs. Colleges of medicine have developed, by their cooperation with community physicians in the last few years, meaningful programs not only for basic medical education but for continuing education, and I think in the allied health professions there are beginning evidences of cooperation. So, as a practitioner as well as somewhat of an educator, I really see much more outreach of the institution into the community than was implied tonight. So, I do not know whether there will be an opportunity to discuss this later or not. I wish there would be.

DEAN ANDRE DE PORRY, UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

States vary and institutions vary. Certainly the contributions of the land grant institutions in continuing education have been long standing and have been very important. I was referring to institutions of higher education. Extension has for many years, until recent years, been somewhat marginal in terms of their being appreciated in relation to the total activities of the institution. I do not think this is subject to dispute although in very recent years it has been changing rapidly, and I do think we are at a point now of real recognition for continuing education in all types of institutions, but your point is very well taken. There are many variations in this picture.

DR. ED BOONE, NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY

I would like to comment and, of course, I must restrict my comments to research findings that we have -- a dissertation that has just been recently completed which looks at the three functions within the university. Public Service or Extension really represents a drop in the bucket as contrasted to research and the resident teaching programs. This was the point that I was trying to emphasize, that certainly we are doing a great deal in public service but much more needs to be done, and we need much more financial support from the legislature in order to build the public service or university extension programs.

QUENTIN H. GESSNER, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

I would like to throw something out. I am not so sure, because of the hour. I perhaps should suggest that we not get into it tonight. I would like to throw it out so that perhaps we could get some feedback on it tomorrow. We were fortunate to take part in the Pilot Project at the University of Michigan during the last year or so, and I notice that in the CEU Question and Answer Booklet, Page (2), a major concern that has surfaced as a result of our Pilot Project. That is this whole area of attendance, also relating this to the acceptance level. We know that, of course, we have had people, we have set up mechanisms to register people and then in some cases, really, you are not really sure what happens, you know. Do they or do they not attend and how many contact hours do they really have, and what really comes out of this? So, we really have talked a lot about what it has been in our pilot stages and what we hope it will be. We have not talked an awful lot about what it is not, and I suspect that some of the things we might be interested in hearing about are those people who might like to comment about the quality aspects of it. Also, the acceptance level by professional societies or agencies that might set up certain kinds of objectives and the obsolescence as we talk about professional engineering and professional medical education. The whole notion that in the CEU life-long learning record that the record can become obsolete, too. So, I am not sure I am asking anybody to respond to that, but I think these are some of the things we might like to have some people react to perhaps tomorrow.

MR. JERRY HARGIS, CEC, VIRGINIA TECH

I think that certainly will be a part of the panel which Grover Andrews has to chair tomorrow at 11:00 A.M. I want to thank you for raising the question.

WALLACE K. NAVE, WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

Dean, you expressed your displeasure with the thoughts of perhaps offering credit, CEU credit, for the personal enrichment type courses, non-credit type courses. Some other speakers have made reference to the possibility of some options being open to universities with regards to electing or not electing to adopt the CEU. Now, I am a little hazy here because the Standard IX, as it was passed in December, states plainly that CEUs will be given for these types of courses. So, I am at a loss to know what I am to do when I go back because I am Chairman of the Standard IX Self Study right now. We are ready to make our final report and I need to have some clarification on this.

DEAN ANDRE DE PORRY, UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

Standard IX does seem to point in the direction of being fairly all inclusive, I think, as far as the c.e. unit approach is concerned for non-credit work. I happen to disagree with it. I disagreed with it when I was on the committee, and I just believe that there needs to be an area outside of any formalized structure.

I think as a matter of just pure practical necessity that if we start offering Continuing Education Units for anything and everything in the non-credit area, however good it may be, it is going to be very difficult to establish its status and to win the kind of recognition for it which may merit the financial support which the Southern Association says should be provided. The Southern Association is making quite a statement when it says that FTE Units, FTE non-credits, ought to be eligible, ought to have equal standing in eligibility for state support, as the regular credit. Well, state legislatures are not members of the Southern Association and they have not spoken yet. I believe rather firmly that if the implementation of the Continuing Education Unit is a progressive kind of thing and if we begin by relating it very carefully to what can be visibly identified as contributing to the economic well-being of a state, then we have a chance of beginning to build state support.

Now mind you, I believe and I hope this came through in what I said, in liberal adult education. I am more concerned about that than I am about the more practical education. I believe in education more than I believe in training although both are necessary, but I just recognize as a practical matter that if we tried to spread the Continuing Education Unit across the board, we run the risk of maybe moving too fast with the system. It will become meaningless and not be accepted and we may lose a wonderful opportunity to have it supported from the people from whom we need support. The question is still an open one, I think, so I cannot give you any advice as to your own particular problems.

JIM CHINN, BROWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Dean, do you see this unit as initiating more effort in the community college level and the university level? Do you see it as a means of initiating more effort by universities in the field of Continuing Education or is it a hindrance?

DEAN ANDRE DE PORRY, UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

No, I see it as a great stimulus to the continuing education effort. I see it here as an organized system which can present itself as meriting support if it is properly done. I think it will greatly stimulate. I think the motivational factor for the adults, student or participant, and for the employer, I think all these things are great and I am very, very enthusiastic about the unit and what it can mean. I think it is going to stimulate programs. It certainly will stimulate if we can get state financial support as some do for credit programs, because these things do tend to be expensive.

MR. JERRY HARGIS, CEC, VIRGINIA TECH

You have been very generous with your time and attention. I think it is time for us to terminate this session. We will begin again tomorrow morning at 8:30 A.M. in this room, and I am sure all of you will be here at that hour. We are adjourned for tonight.

Symposium II

MR. C. CLARK JONES, CEC, VIRGINIA TECH

I would like to welcome you to the second day of our conference on our Continuing Education Unit.

From the design of this program, you can see that we feel that there are three major components of our society that will be drastically affected by the use of the Continuing Education Unit. They are as follows: (1) the academic or institutional sector - as we have heard from Gordon Sweet, Bill Turner, Ed Boone, and Andre de Porry in this area, (2) the industrial sector will be heavily affected - we were fortunate to have Carl Tripp from Union Carbide here with us to make his most pertinent comments, and (3) the governmental sector - an area that we really haven't discussed in any detail at this stage. It is staggering, I think, when you stop to consider the number of training programs and educational activities that are carried out in the governmental sector, be it the local, state, or federal level. We have three gentlemen with us this morning who will address us in these areas.

The first gentleman that will address you this morning is Dr. William L. Flowers who has chaired quite a few of the sessions. I am sure most of you have had an opportunity to meet Dr. Flowers. He is, as you know, the Associate Dean of our Extension Division and also Director of the Center. A little background on Dr. Flowers will include the fact that he was educated at the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill for his undergraduate and masters degree. He spent about 15 years in the public school system of North Carolina, both as a teacher and as a principal, but primarily as a principal of several schools. He spent some time with the North Carolina fund as a grant officer in Durham, North Carolina. He served as a free lance consultant for three to four years in the late 60's. At the time, he was also finishing work for his doctorate in adult education. From there he was Associate Director of the Division of Community and Urban Affairs at North Carolina State University and then he was enticed to come to VPI this past summer.

The second gentleman that will be addressing us this morning is Mr. Al Stem, a member of the State Personnel Staff. As a matter of fact, he is the coordinator of this program and is responsible to the State Director of Personnel and to the office of the Governor for all areas of training and employee development in the state government, that is, the state of Virginia. Also, he is director of the Virginia Public Executive Institute and Chairman of the Public Executive Technical Advisory Committee that is educationally supported by this institute. He is also Chairman of the State Agency Training Committee which is composed of training officers that represent major state agencies. He is also responsible with others for such things as the administration of the Inter-Governmental Personnel Act of 1970 and the Virginia Commonwealth Intern Program.

The third gentleman who will work with us this morning is Colonel Gilbert A. Monti. The Colonel will be a resource person who will answer questions that are appropriately directed to him. For a little background on Colonel Monti, he is the Chief of the Program Training Service of the Community Affairs Section of the Division of State Planning in the State of Virginia. This service is responsible for the development, delivery, coordination and evaluation of state and federally funded training programs for the Commonwealth's local governments. The major programs which Colonel Monti has responsibility for are the Title VIII Programs which are funded through a grant from HUD, the gist of which is the conducting of seminars, short courses, and workshops on matters of topical concern for local and state governmental employees working in community development and other HUD related activities. Colonel Monti also has responsibility in the area of the Inter-Governmental Personnel Act, through a grant from the Civil Service Commission and in cooperation with the Division of Personnel. He is responsible for the delivery of projects and personnel administration for improvement and training of local governments. Without any further ado, I will give you Dr. William L. Flowers for the first presentation.

DR. W. L. FLOWERS, JR., VIRGINIA TECH

## Continuing Education - Growth and Impact

Growth of continuing education in America was inevitable. Inherent in this valued concept is the lifelong development of citizens in a framework of time, format and location most appropriate to needs and convenience of adults educatively inclined.

A range of topics for continuing education is limited only by the limits of available knowledge, identification of interested publics and a willingness of educators to organize, adapt and teach within the continuing education format.

The consumer of continuing adult education today is usually a mature, gainfully employed citizen in a position to quickly apply new knowledge, willing to pay his own way or belonging to an organization willing to continue supporting his individual development.

## Historical Recap

During the past four decades, professions, industry, business and labor increasingly began to adopt and apply educative elements of the extension education model which worked so well where regularly applied by Land Grant Institutions, organizations, universities, agencies, and professional groups. Gradually, group leaders began to realize that application of the educative process on a continuing basis was essential if organizational dry rot and learning lassitude were to be kept from developing in the growing edges of those social structures.

Concentrated instruction for shorter periods than those of more formalized university or college curricula was essential if respect for a work schedule of the employed person was to be considered.

Training before accepting or away from a job which was an earlier American educational pattern, developed into "on-the-job" education as individual support for continuing education instruction was replaced by company or organizational financing. Bringing educational programs to the people, putting them within consumer reach and organizing programs in short, effective workshops, seminars or conferences became a well known pattern of continuing or extension adult education.

Interestingly enough, educational organizations themselves have been among the last to recognize and achieve a need of agencies paying the bill for continued educational growth of educational personnel. Witness this summer the thousands of public school teachers, community college personnel and others of educational institutions who will enroll in studies at their own expense.

But this has changed, is changing and will continue to change during an exciting challenge to those of this decade. Let us examine two exciting concepts which tend to confirm this belief.

## Twin Concepts - The CEU and the IPA

In my opinion, we are witness to the most significant twin concepts to appear on the educational scene since birth of the Land Grant College and Extension Service. The coincidence of birth, the growth of the Continuing Education Unit (CEU) and the support for educational training for government and agency personnel provided by the Intergovernmental Personnel Act (IPA) of 1970 will change training patterns and measurement for adults in training in America as we have known it.

The CEU is a new uniform measuring concept and the IPA provides policy direction and financial support for training of government and agency personnel.

## CONTINUING EDUCATION UNIT

### A Uniform Measuring Unit

The Continuing Education Unit being currently discussed and used by some institutions satisfies a need for a measuring device which has grown during recent years. A fast growing society began to give more attention to updating people in educational terms using the short intensive educational experience basis. This approach has been successfully used in continuing education centers throughout the country and has become accepted as a means through which busy, working citizens in agencies, industries or in government might begin to keep up with what is going on in this fast moving society.

Professional leadership from business, industry, labor, colleges, universities, government, armed forces, junior colleges, hospitals, agencies, cabinet posts, publishers and others came together in 1968 as a task force to develop a concept which became known as The Continuing Education Unit.

The concern of these educational leaders from government, industry, professions and business was in response to a need for setting standards and keeping records for non-credit educational experiences in a form which might be used by organizations and administrators.

The Continuing Education Unit represents one way of uniformally keeping and maintaining a permanent record of the educational experiences in the "non-credit" program areas as these educational experiences are planned and awarded by institutions or organizations during training of individuals, for agencies, for business organizations, professional organizations and other groups. The Continuing Education Unit is planned as a measure of non-credit achievements of individuals and it constitutes a recent device which we think will be used increasingly in the future.

As you heard yesterday, one CEU is based on 10 contact hours of a well-planned educational program executed by appropriately qualified professional staff.

Leaders of the National Task Force pointed the way supported in a pilot project by several universities scattered over the nation. Subsequent to this the Southern Association of Schools and Colleges responded by adopting on 1 December 1971 what is now known as revised Standard IX. This made the Continuing Education Unit part of a new region-wide concept designed to provide a uniform measure of attainment in non-credit educational programs. The region-wide focus initiated by the leaders of the accrediting agencies of the Southern Association of Schools and Colleges may well become a nation-wide system in the immediate future.

Courage and foresight among those of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools paved the way for implementation of a new uniform instrument of measurement for "non-credit" educational programs.

## THE IPA OF 1970 - The Other Twin

Legislative leadership actions developed the other twin concept known as the IPA (Intergovernmental Personnel Act) which provides financial support for training of agency personnel and a structure to which this CEU concept will be frequently applied. One organizational common denominator among interested groups was the Civil Service Commission but you will learn more of that from other presenters.

Perhaps the most far reaching support emphasis given to continuing education in the decade of the 1970's is the Intergovernmental Personnel Act. It sets a government policy toward continuing education and provides resources. We can safely predict that multiplier factors related to this emphasis will change the service demand for continuing education as we have known it. Educational institutions in American will have a new opportunity to demonstrate whether education is indeed America's magic and whether educational opportunities of new dimensions will be developed to serve government agencies through developing IPA training program plans. This could as well become America's educational institution's missed opportunity.

## Background

During the 1950's and 1960's as government service grew, demands for more service took the easier route. The "add more staff" solution became a standard response given by most agency and subagency groups as an answer for the need to gain in productive governmental efficiency. Even the introduction of a computer did little to help. "Add more staff" was given a new impetus with introduction of "labor saving" devices. Not so much attention was given to improved production through performance evaluation or regularly retraining of agency staff to gain better utilization of skills.

Deteriorating public service of agencies caused a hard look to be taken in the 1960's and again in May of 1970. That examination indicated an inadequate philosophical inclination and delivery of on-the-job training (or in-service) existed in the capabilities of local, state and national

government agencies. What was thought to have been a sound educative process within agencies was not working well. Clearly the emphasis and values placed by governments on continuing education was not adequate. Less than 10% of the cities surveyed employed full-time training planners or coordinators at the same time problems in the cities were rapidly multiplying.

What is now referred to as the Consensus at College Park developed with an emphasis on the need for continuing educational service for government agency personnel. A general goal was to "make training and development an integral part of the management process of state and local government agencies." This Continuing Education Service (CES) was designed to become a national continuing education service to be operated by six "public service organizations". These were (1) U.S. Conference of Mayors, (2) Council of State Governments, (3) National League of Cities, (4) National Governor's Conference, (5) National Association of Counties and (6) International City Management Associations.

So it was that we came to where we are today and the added emphasis for a need to educate and reeducate government personnel. With that kind of thrust, we may project that within two decades we will develop in this country a continuing education service which will serve as many adults in regular educational programs as there are enrolled public school youth today. Further, there may also develop a system or program plan in America for educational service for those above 30 years of age more extensive than what we have today for those under 30. All of which may develop such that before the end of this century we may find a common pattern of continuous education in a job-related lattice (not ladder) unlike any we may conceive of today.

Beyond that, we are getting away from the "kiddie kick" in application of educational development opportunities. Retired persons who have served themselves and their country well may demand and get a delayed sabbatical series of contiguous educative years supported by resources of their labors during earlier years. Man can effectively learn and change as long as man is rational and alive. Endorsement of that concept is already here.

## What of the Future?

Some have claimed that universities and agencies have ranged in attitude between inertia and indifference toward any plan for closely cooperating and working together. While this may be a classic example of overstatement, it strikes a note of truth in too many cases. Opportunity for change exists in the seventies. The twin concepts of this presentation promise to disturb all educational and agency leaders who would advocate maintenance of the educative status quo. Since progress is related to dissatisfaction, this is good.

Continuing Education and off-campus programs are being "discovered" by some professors who have experienced a non-participating involvement.

What seems unique to some university professionals is that the consumer wants educational programs

(a) in his community.

(b) of shorter duration than some programs planned as quarter or semester-long programs.

(c) in line with his focus of interest rather than that of his professor.

Increasingly, it is clear that all the adult clients will not come to the campus but require that the professional educational planners dissolve a sometimes formerly rigid posture in favor of service to the people where they are.

Educational institutions must extend educative, effective, flexible service to government agencies if agencies and education are to attain a continuously improving linkage of service to citizens. This must be done with a continued emphasis on organizational independence. We cite here an example of what could develop.

State vs Federal, Big vs Bigger, Bigger = Better.

It would be a serious mistake for state governments to assume that because the Federal Government is so much bigger, it is also more efficient or better. In like manner, federal agencies have at times shown a posture of bureaucratic omnipotence believing themselves to be best because they are bigger or better staffed than state agencies.

The exchange concept as among equals can make this program work. But as sure as a one-way posture develops, this will be written off as another bureaucratic blunder. The importance of educational institutions maintaining a posture of independence gains new significance.

In the planning, states must be involved. Cities must be involved. Counties must be involved -- and, above all, institutions of higher education must be involved as institutions. They must not submit to the avarice of some university personnel who tend to sell their services through a consultant route while undercutting the parent institutions.

The "twenty percent" rule for private consultant service allowed professional staff by most institutions ought to get close scrutiny during this period when the governments need staff support and universities need some additional resources. Rather than recycling rhetoric, universities must efficiently produce more effective personnel.

While it is less than popular among some university personnel to assume this position, the cycle of loss to state and local governments and to institutions of higher education must be closely examined.

This cycle of loss has been produced by esculating entrepreneurship by faculty who rarely seem to realize that their temporary gain may mean a long term personal loss.

Similarly, as universities and continuing education services offer these needed educational services, state and federal agencies must learn to call on and depend on universities and colleges for educational services which agencies in the past have decided to do "in-house". The latter agency effort has not worked either, perhaps largely because there is little or effective evaluation by one who examines himself.

Universities must re-examine the "overhead" costs which have been added to certain training and research contracts.

Public personnel resource development must be seen as a continuing education concept by higher education institutions which may ideally develop an on-going training and retraining posture similar to the teacher training institutions which were so well known in the second quarter of this century. Professional, administrative and technical staff must become the continuing training concern of our institutions. And, we must do it cooperatively with and effectively for services to governmental agencies.

MR. AL STEM, STATE PERSONNEL, COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

The effects on individuals of growth, complexity, rapid change, and the technical knowledge explosion are well known to each of us. No special immunity has insulated our social and political institutions from the endless array of problems which privately concern us all. Indeed, the awakening of American Society to our current domestic challenges, responsibilities, and social problems has been translated directly to a call for effective governmental response. Called on to assume a more active role in the solution of major problems that cluster in such areas as health, housing, hunger, crime, welfare, education, training, pollution, and transportation, the Federal Government, with its unlimited fiscal capabilities, responded. In the past five years, the Federal Government spent more than a quarter of a trillion dollars in the search for solutions to social problems. The singular lack of success of these efforts has seriously shaken public confidence in the ability of government to act effectively. To many, persistence of these problems indicates that if lasting results are to be achieved, the State governments must become active participants in the Federal system. Further, the interdependency of units of governments has been sufficiently illustrated to convince many that governments cannot act in isolation. Successful solutions demand the concerted efforts of all units of government.

Closely related are two other concepts: decentralization and regionalization. The trend today is toward decentralization. It has become clear that everything which must be done cannot be done from a central source in Washington. Neither is a central source in Richmond the answer for Virginia. While the States must reemerge within the Federal system if satisfactory solutions to our nation's problems are to be achieved, this alone is not sufficient to assure the sought-after results. Local units of government must act together to meet common problems if contemporary challenges are to be met. This is the heart of Virginia's planning district concept, and nineteen regional planning districts in varying stages of operational readiness have been established.

The lessons of the planning districts have not been lost in State agencies. Task forces of agencies with related or complimentary functions (six have been established: Administration, Economic Resources, Education, Finance, Human Resources, and Transportation and Public Safety) meet to discuss with one another their plans and programs.

Simultaneously with the developments noted above has occurred a heightened awareness that while organizational change may be necessary to effective government, structural change alone is not sufficient. Government is people, and more effective government requires more effective people and more effective people management. Recognition that governmental effectiveness can be enhanced with more effective public servants and personnel management by an

approach maximizing intergovernmental cooperation led to the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (IPA). This landmark legislation and the approach the governments of Virginia have assumed to take full advantage of the opportunities it makes available are the major considerations of this discussion.

The closing days of 1970 brought a successful conclusion to more than five years of effort by concerned persons in the Congress, Executive Branch, and State and Local Governments to foster a concerted approach to strengthening the Federal System through the improvement of public personnel resources. With the growth of Federal grants-in-aid to State and local governments, it had become increasingly apparent that the quality of State and local government personnel and their capacity to respond to the critical and complex problems of government was a matter of national concern and national priority. The Congressional response to this recognition resulted in legislation authorizing a number of different approaches to the problem of improving public service effectiveness. These will be discussed below. First, however, it is necessary to understand the primary objectives of various titles of the Act. IPA is designed to promote the realization of two principal objectives:

1. The strengthening and/or development of personnel systems capable of responding to the challenges of modern government. This objective focuses on the improvement of personnel systems in order to provide units of government with management tools and talent to more effectively address our nation's problems. Additionally, it provides governments with the means to continually upgrade the skills of their professional, administrative and technical staff.

2. The fostering of intergovernmental cooperation as an approach to meeting the objective detailed above.

Within the framework of these broad goals, the IPA offers state and local governments, both individually and cooperatively, several approaches to strengthen their public service. Upon request, the U. S. Civil Service Commission (CSC), which is the administering agency for the Intergovernmental Personnel Act, is authorized to offer technical assistance to State and local governments seeking to improve their systems in personnel administration. The CSC may waive, in whole or in part, the cost of such technical assistance.

In addition, Title IV of the Act authorizes the temporary assignment of personnel between the Federal government and state and local governments and institutions of higher education. This Title provides a method whereby staff of various governmental levels may gain insight and experience in the operations of programs in our Federal system, thus transcending the parochialism currently common. It further offers a means whereby governments may temporarily benefit from the expertise existing at another level of government.

Titles II and III authorize the Civil Service Commission to make grants to State and local governments. Title II authorizes grants for research and action projects to improve all aspects of personnel administration systems including, but not limited to, recruitment, examining, and pay and classification. Title III of the Act focuses on training as an essential element of public personnel resource development. It provides for three different approaches which State and local governments may employ in upgrading management and other skills of current professional, administrative, and technical staff. First, Title III authorizes the admission of state and local government employees to Federal training programs. It permits Federal agencies to waive, in whole or in part, the costs to state and local governments of such training.

Additionally, Title III authorizes the CSC to make grants to state and local governments for the development and conduct of training programs tailored to meet the needs of these units of government. CSC may also make grants for government service fellowships for state and local employees to return to college for advanced degree study.

Several approaches are possible to the IPA grant program which make available opportunities for personnel training and management improvement projects and for government service fellowships. States are encouraged to assume a leadership role in developing projects with local governments. While this role may be assumed pursuant to State law or on the basis of agreements with local governments, the Governor of each State in any event must designate a single State agency to have overall responsibility for the grant program. While individual local governments or combinations of such governments may choose to participate in the IPA grant program apart from any State efforts, gubernatorial review of such independent proposals is preserved. Governments in the Commonwealth of Virginia have chosen the statewide approach to the grant program based on agreements, as the approach holding most promise for meeting their specific needs.

The State Environment. During the years immediately preceding the IPA, little was being done in Virginia to improve the overall outlook for public service training. The situation was characterized by lack of program coordination horizontally and vertically among governmental agencies. There were some attempts, of course, but generally they were unsuccessful in achieving real coordination.

Federal programs tended toward functional, categorical approaches, with no mechanism for coordination. In the first place, there was no Federal focus for coordination, no framework around which to build. Secondly, there was an overwhelming emphasis on delivery of tangible goods and services through grant programs, with an accompanying de-emphasis on training public servants to better deliver those services.

To a great extent, the limitations of the categorical grant approach induced secularization of planning and training efforts. The added factor that Federal programs supporting training generally provide for only limited training, each for "its own kind" added to this trend for example, health grants trained specialists in health, planning grants planners, etc. There were and continue to be few cases where general management and policy or skills training were furnished across functional lines.

This situation was exacerbated at the State level where no institutional or structural focus for coordination existed. Training programs tended to be departmentalized, localized, and uncoordinated. Where training programs existed, the approach commonly taken was to buy pre-packaged programs rather than to tailor a program to meet specific training needs and reach organizational objectives. Thus, training in the public sector was characterized by a "shot-gun" approach with little attention devoted to a comprehensive assessment of training needs, a setting of training objectives, and the development of programs to meet those objectives.

In this environment, the reaction of the State's institutions of higher education was mixed. Generally, individual institutions concentrated on "selling" pre-packaged training programs, rarely building programs from the bottom up. While there was some community involvement and more than a few efforts at institutional coordination, and although some individual institutions (and individuals) were involved seriously in meeting public service training needs, the institutions of higher education, like units of government at all levels, lacked a feasible focus of mechanism through which they could work.

The Environment in Motion. While the above account may present a negative picture, several developments at the State level affecting State agencies, local governments and institutions of higher education, were in the process of changing this "static environment".

The establishment in Virginia of the Division of State Planning and Community Affairs (DSPCA) in 1968, and the subsequent organization of 19 regional planning districts, gave the State and local governments a focal point for the coordination of planning, resources, and community services. The ultimate impact of this planning structure is not yet apparent; however, the potential is unlimited.

When the decision was made to develop a Statewide training plan under Title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964, as amended, a Title VIII Office for its administration was established within DSPCA. Title VIII was a means to initiate Statewide training for public officials. It became a vehicle to introduce a broad range of managerial and specialized techniques to a broad range of public officials. Although it was difficult, with a limited staff and trainee eligibility limitations, to tailor Title VIII programs to meet specific local needs, a beginning was made in the process of trying to assess State and local government training needs.

As it became apparent that DSPCA would play a major role in implementing IPA, the Title VIII Office was renamed the Training Programs Section and given broadened, though flexibly defined, responsibilities for public service training for local governments. In addition, the staff was enlarged to help meet this broader responsibility.

While the Training Programs Section (now Service) was undergoing limited expansion, the regional planning districts were viewed as a logical coordinator or focal point for needs assessment and implementation of training programs. As will be explained below, responses from the districts to this concept were as varied as the geographic regions and personalities involved. But, the establishment of DSPCA and the regional planning districts meant that these were now possible foci for local government public service training at the State and regional levels.

Whereas these developments in DSPCA mostly affected local governments, other processes were in motion affecting State agency training and the role of educational institutions in continuing education for the public sector.

Early in his administration, Governor Linwood Holton commissioned fifty-seven business and professional men to prepare a study of the operations of Virginia State Government. During an intensive 12 week period, this prestigious group of executives and managers, known collectively as the Governor's Management Study, Inc., prepared a document that suggested ways of improving the delivery of governmental services to citizens of the Commonwealth at reduced cost. Among the recommendations in the Management Study was one that would influence both employee training and development and the implementation and administration of the Intergovernmental Personnel Act in Virginia. This recommendation, related directly to the operations of the State Division of Personnel, suggested that the Division, in the role of a central staff operation, should "have responsibility to develop and coordinate a uniform, constructive, and progressive personnel administration program for implementation by the employing agencies." One aspect of this comprehensive program "should include . . . training and development."

By mid-1970 the Division of Personnel had proceeded to become more actively involved in the training and development of State employees. Before determining the extent of the Division's involvement, a number of studies were made and analyzed. The results demonstrated that the bulk of training involving State employees had been initiated by individual agencies, each one generally acting independently of the others. The greatest share of training fell into the technical or specialist category of improving basic job-related skills of employees, the studies showed, and only the very largest State agencies had training efforts in the areas of managerial, administrative and supervisory development. With this information, the Division of Personnel saw its role as one of encouraging the State agencies to participate in all levels

of training, and, further, to coordinate these efforts with each other and with programs previously in existence. To precipitate this role, the Division required the necessary tools of educational and financial support and a meaningful way of demonstrating the effectiveness of these supports.

In the early fall of 1970, the Director of the Division of Personnel went before the Research and Development Advisory Committee of the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia where he presented the Division's objectives and needs relative to training and development in the State public service. The "RADAC", composed of influential representatives from the various higher educational institutions in the Commonwealth, responded with enthusiasm. The RADAC formed a sub-committee, the Executive Institute Technical Advisory Committee, (EITAC), to advise and assist the Division of Personnel in its training efforts and to seek financial support for these efforts. The publication of the Management Study in November, 1970, clearly supported these new endeavors of the Division of Personnel. With the commitment and support of the Governor, the Commissioner of Administration, the Director of Personnel, the Management Study recommendation, and the educational institutions, the EITAC was left only with the task of determining the best possible way to proceed.

Composed of representatives from the University of Virginia, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, the College of William and Mary, Virginia Commonwealth University, Old Dominion University, the University of Richmond, and the Division of Personnel, the EITAC quickly secured a grant under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965. This grant supported not only the initial and follow-up projects but also the expenses incurred by the EITAC membership.

After several weeks of discussion, the EITAC recommended that in order to build a commitment to training among the various State agencies that it would be necessary to demonstrate the effectiveness of training to the executive leadership in State government. Specifically, the EITAC suggested that a four day seminar involving the Governor, the Commissioner of Administration, and approximately 30 key agency heads be held sometime in early spring. The seminar would be guided by two faculty trainers, skilled in organizational development, and financially supported by Title I and State funds. With the Governor's personal endorsement, the seminar was scheduled and run on March 21-25, 1971, in Williamsburg, Virginia.

The overwhelming success of this initial seminar had profound impact on future developments: it demonstrated the quality and capabilities of Virginia's educational institutions to respond to continuing education needs in the public sector; it provided encouragement to the Division of Personnel to move forward in its training efforts; it showed the value of developmental programs to the participating agency heads; and, it lead to the voluntary formation of six informal task forces, each one composed of those agencies with similar functional areas of service. In addition to these important features, the Williamsburg experience provided substantive meaning to a conceptual need for a State Executive Institute (SEI).

With Title I financial support and the EITAC educational support, the SEI in the course of the next six months had developmental seminars for three State agencies, two of the recently formed task forces, and a two day follow-up for the original Williamsburg Group. A significant addition to these programs was a training seminar for a local unit of government, the City of Richmond.

The involvement of the Division of Personnel in all these programs greatly influenced the way in which the Division would respond to the implementation and administration of the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970. The purpose of the Act seemed well suited to the training approach taken by Virginia.

All of the foregoing events were to determine in part the response of the Commonwealth to the opportunities which became available upon passage of IPA in 1970. In addition, some initial policy decisions were made which were to define the manner in which Virginia developed its statewide IPA plan for state agencies and local governments and which today shape the manner in which public service training is being provided.

## General Policy Objectives

Three initial policy decisions reflecting the general objectives of the State IPA effort were:

1. that the State should take a leadership role in implementing IPA in Virginia.

2. that planning for IPA should be approached on a basis of intergovernmental cooperation, to the maximum extent feasible; and

3. that the development of the IPA plan would be based on the needs of government as they perceived them.

The state leadership role took on several different aspects. Earliest indications in the planning process were that IPA would be most successful in Virginia, if the state would provide technical assistance to units of government in personnel administration and training. To achieve this capability the State undertook to build up its own in-house resources in these areas. A commitment was made to rely, to the maximum extent possible, not only on the resources of state and local public agencies, but further upon the State's educational institutions in the development and implementation of programs in personnel administration and training.

The intergovernmental cooperation involved in IPA planning took three general forms. First, there was cooperation among state agencies. Second, there was cooperation between State and local governments;

finally, there was cooperation among units of local government. The regional planning districts played an integral role in this process.

The decision to develop a State IPA plan from the "bottom up" involved two assumptions. The first was that the plan would consist of input concerning needs determined by units of government rather than the State IPA Staff. A corollary to this was the realization that decision-making for specific projects would be decentralized, to rest with the client units of government.

The Planning Approach. Even before it became apparent that IPA would be implemented in Virginia by a State plan in "cooperation with local units of government", the basic planning approach had been selected. The Division of Personnel was designated as the State Agency to administer the Act "with the assistance and cooperation of the Division of State Planning and Community Affairs." Although all phases of planning were closely coordinated between the two agencies, each had its own responsibilities in the process.

While the Division of Personnel assumed primary responsibility for coordinating the assessment of needs within State agencies, the planning approach taken by DSPCA's Training Programs Service was shaped by two primary factors. First, the local government portion of the State IPA Plan was to be developed "by agreement" between the State and local governments, who otherwise could apply independently for IPA funds. Second, the limited Training Programs Service staff made it impossible to personally and individually contact concerned local governments. Thus, in line with its own commitment to the planning district concept and the intent of the IPA to maximize intergovernmental cooperation, DSPCA worked with established planning districts to develop projects for local governments participating in the Statewide plan.

Basically, no two planning districts are alike. There are variations in personnel, jurisdictions and problems that are practically infinite in variety. Thus, the planning district staffs were allowed to create their own role in implementing IPA. They were asked to serve as a forum for airing of personnel and training problems and as coordinator of any plans or projects desired. The leadership demonstrated in fulfilling these functions ranged from no response at all to initial contacts, to negative response, to positive leadership even to the point of being the implementor of regional programs. In some cases the leadership even came from individual jurisdictions and individuals within them. No matter what the response was, the result was enough input to enable the creation of the Virginia IPA Plan, a plan that could provide services to any part of the State willing to commit the time necessary for program success.

## Planning, Policy Decisions and Objectives

In working with localities and state agencies to conduct responsive training programs, the state IPA staff has attempted to help these units of government by relieving them of much of the financial burden of program development and conduct. While IPA requires the grantee to match every three Federal dollars with one dollar of its own money, the Commonwealth has been able to absorb much of this match requirement. Thus, for most projects, the recipient locality or agency needs to provide only a minimum of match to the program and most of this may be in the form of in-kind services rather than hard cash.

Most of the management and executive development training programs conducted under IPA are developed under the auspices of the Virginia Public Executive Institute (VPEI) which is a part of the Governor's Office and is directed by staff in the Division of Personnel. VPEI, unlike most executive training institutes, is not a permanent facility with a governing board. Rather, it is an administrative concept or umbrella for the design, delivery and evaluation of executive development programs within the State and is an outgrowth of the State Executive Institute mentioned in chapter two. In the development of training programs, VPEI relies heavily on the advice of the Public Executive Institute Technical Advisory Committee (PEITAC, formerly EITAC), concerning educational resources and program content, and on the Virginia Municipal League and Virginia Association of Counties concerning the needs of their memberships.

The flexible conceptual umbrella of VPEI, without the build-up of an invested bureaucracy, offers a mechanism of positive value in the delivery of public service training in Virginia. The collaboration of State agencies, local governments and associations of local governments, and educational institutions offer flexibility in the assessment of need, design, resource identification and evaluation of training responsive to the participant units of government.

## Service Concept

In line with the decision of the State to take a leadership role in the implementation of IPA in Virginia, the State, through the Division of Personnel and Division of State Planning and Community Affairs, has moved to establish several vehicles or quasi-formal institutional devices for linking together interested officials and institutions engaged in public service personnel administration and training. Since IPA of Virginia is relatively new, there is as yet no real assessment of how well this infra-structure is working to rationalize the public service approach to manpower utilization.

In the area of executive development training, the VPEI was established to assist localities and state agencies in acquiring training based upon need and, through the PEITAC, to acquire the best educational resource for conducting the training. In addition, the Division of State Planning and Community Affairs, through its Training

Programs Service, has three field representatives whose primary responsibility is to work with individual localities and planning districts through all stages of program development and to draw in appropriate resource personnel to assist and advise the localities.

In addition, the Division of Personnel has staffed up to provide further assistance to localities in such technical areas as pay and classification and the development of model personnel handbooks.

At the State level, a Federal Grants Coordinating Committee has been established. It is chaired by the Division of Personnel and has representatives of all state agencies with federal grants money for training. While it is still in developmental stages, it offers promise as a means to eliminate duplication and overlap of effort in the expenditure of Federal/State resources in training.

Finally, two ad hoc training committees have been set up. The purpose of each is two-fold:

1. to help units or agencies of government to assess their own training and development needs in a comprehensive manner; and

2. to plan for these needs in a way which conserves scarce resources.

Specifically, on point two, these committees serve as a forum for identifying needs common to more than one unit. Quite frequently, where two units identify the same need, the combination of their resources can permit the development of a program which neither of them could support individually. The Division of Personnel chairs the State Agency Training Committee to advise on programs which cut across state agency lines. The Division of State Planning and Community Affairs chairs a Planning District Regional Training Committee which advises on training needs which cut across planning district lines. In activities with both of these committees, the State IPA staff attempts to perform a "brokerage" function in identifying and making available Federal Grants funding (from multiple Federal sources) to supplement limited State and local resources.

In summation, the IPA has given State and local governments in Virginia an opportunity to work for more comprehensive public service manpower utilization. As in any "real world" situation, there are and will continue to be problems in coordinating the multiple "actors" involved in this area. It is felt, though, that the Commonwealth's approach offers many positive opportunities for opening lines of communication and for directing a concerted attack by all on the problems and challenges of effective use and development of public service resources.

Discussion Session

MADISON E. WEIDNER, RUTGERS UNIVERSITY, EXTENSION DIVISION

Mr. Stem, we have just had a survey in New Jersey about setting up a public service institute and there is some confusion in our minds as to whether or not they are going to replace what the universities and colleges have been doing. Now, how does your Virginia Public Executive Institute go about being a coordinating agency, or are you going to actually offer and hire the instruction? Also, are you going to set up the courses, the programs, or whatever it is by acting as an educational institution?

MR. AL STEM, STATE PERSONNEL, COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

Briefly stated, no. This decision was made in the office of the Governor, and actually came into play before the passage of the act. The program that we were running under the institute was funded before the passage of IPA under Title I grant and it is still partially supported under a Title I grant, which is an example of inter-grant cooperation. But to answer your question, the decision was made in our office that we had an alternative to build, as it were, a stable of horses and a level of expertise in the state government itself, in terms of the Office of the Governor moving from there to a kind of bricks and mortar type situation, and perhaps from there, to a credit granting organization and right up to the degree level. But it was felt that at this time, given the size of the program and given the fact that we have a great deal of respect and admiration for our educational institutions in the State of Virginia, why should we build a stable of horses in the state government when we could pull together the educational resources in a coordinative capacity and a cooperative capacity through a committee fashion and have this be the educational resource to the state in this program.

MADISON E. WEIDNER, RUTGERS UNIVERSITY, EXTENSION DIVISION

That is much better; I am glad to hear that is the way you went. We could just see the institute, training institutes, and state-wide institutions taking all our professors to teach for them on an outside basis, with no control over the faculty and what they did. They would not have time to teach Russian extensions, so I think that is a little better.

MR. JOHN W. WILLIAMS, G.E.D. DIRECTOR, WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA

I would like to be a devil's advocate. There are three of us here who do represent a tremendous consumer market. The military personnel are interested in credit for the type of training that they do and not in a formal degree type of program. Of course, we use the CLEPT programs, examinations, and evaluations to get some of these credits. I think the consumer that we represent is probably a group of people that will end up as civil servants. Yet, we end up with public servants who have a tremendous amount of training time on their resumes, and are trying to adjust the operation to their experience. Colonel Monti can verify some of these facts. Are we trying to take courses that are normal

extension and throw them away and put them under some other disguise that people cannot recognize? Is this really a means of throwing out credit type courses where they do not have to fight the agrument?

DR. WILLIAM L. FLOWERS, VIRGINIA TECH

I think that the general problem that you address is that military does represent consumer market, which you feel is not now being served. I think yesterday one of the speakers touched on the nature of transferability of credit of one sort or another. I guess you know there is no easy answer to what you are saying here, but I am glad that you injected that need. I think that this is a third dimension of what we are hearing about, in terms of the need for additional service. You were saying that the military complex, particularly as it begins to phase out personnel and begin to phase some of them back into civilian life, as well as into training programs, needs the services of institute. Is this what I am hearing? You need this kind of service from community colleges and colleges and universities.

What you are describing in terms of unmet needs in education exists in the civilian sector as well. We have been watching with interest in this state, the number of outside institutions, that is, non-state institutions that are coming here to provide services for Virginians, such as Utah, California, South Carolina, Florida, and others. I do not know percisely what the answer is here, but I think that this is the kind of thing Grover, that the Southern Association might begin to take a look at. What is it that we are doing in the way of service? It would appropriately come under Standard IX as we begin to address ourselves to the off campus type programs.

COLONEL GIL MONTI, STATE PLANNING, COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

I would like to address myself just a few moments to that, because I can well understand the problem, having been in it for many years. We do have these services in the military. The officers (take them for instance for a moment) have basic courses, advanced courses, and can go on to the senior courses. The armed forces in the war college and what not, attend many specialized courses. The same goes for enlisted and non-commissioned officers. They go to specialized courses for every little thing that has to be done. They undergo some type of training for a week, two weeks, five weeks, and six weeks, and I really do not know of any way that they can be equated to some type of credit on the civilian side.

I think perhaps Mr. Williams is right when he said that possibly education ought to take a look to see what is going on to see that credits are established to something that will relate to what is being learned in the services.

Further, I have heard a lot about transition. I got out of the service and I went right to work, but there is a need for this transition of people leaving the services to come back into civilian life. I think

a lot of it is a shame, because there really is not the understanding, the relationship, the enthusiasm, to really get with the transition to make it successful. I do think that this is something that should be studied. I think it shouldn't go on too long because it is something that is needed, and needed right now. How you do it, I do not know; but it should be done the same way we have been talking about what we do with Title XIII, the same with Andre de Porry with Title I, and with other things that we do with local governments, in that there are courses upon courses upon courses, one-day, two-days, three-days, seminars, and workshops.

I am not an educator. My job is to deliver training. My job is to see what is needed and to try to get it to the locality the best I can, and Al does it with State. But the educational system has got to work with us hand in hand. We have got to look at it and say, "O.K., what are you doing?" How often do these things happen? What can we pay on it? So, I think we are on the right track with the conference, and I think that we will play a great part in furnishing what you may need to base, to prove, or to help you with the establishment of the CEU.

MR. AL STEM, STATE PERSONNEL, COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

The greatest need now as I see it, is to help the people do a better job, to upgrade their skills in their work. This is what they are crying for; this is what the greatest demand is at this point. I am not sure he is concerned whether he gets a CEU or not, at this point. If he becomes concerned that he wants a CEU, then we will try to meet that need as well. My concern in the CEU is that guidelines and rules and regulations to meet institutional needs might get in the way of meeting the needs of the client. This will be a real challenge, I think, for institutions in drafting the guidelines on whatever approach they wish to take with the CEU.

DR. J. FRED BURGESS, COLUMBUS COLLEGE

I am with Columbus College and I respond to two points: (1) apparently someone has never heard of the ACE guide for military service credit and I operate a military program so I am fairly familar with it. The military, as I have seen it, want to get college credit for purely vocational training. Many of these things they are now able to get college credit for in many institutions. But, what they have not faced up to is the use of some unit like the CEU towards their own career goals. They had failed to take a cumulative total of all the training that they have had and put it towards a career goal themselves.

As to the civilian governmental employee, it will become important to these people when governments make it important to them for their careers. If the government has no plans and has never heard of such a thing as a CEU, then we cannot expect the employee to be interested in gaining CEU's toward some career goal. For instance, we have many programs which civil service employees take. They come back years later

to us and ask for some sort of a certificate stating that they had been there because they want it in their personnel files, because it means something to them in their goals, in their advancement.

It is up to the leadership in the government to make the CEU worthwhile to the people; the people cannot make it worthwhile to the government.

DEAN G. E. LOREY, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI, ROLLA

My comment has been abbreviated by the very excellent statement which was just made which echos the thought I had in mind. We are all here trying to do some new thinking about a new area of education--- the development and implementation of the Continuing Education Unit. This puts an obligation on institutions of higher education. It puts an obligation on such areas of concern as the government, the military, and industry to look at this new baby we have and to see whether or not, in a more flexible way and in a more useful way, it can relate itself and help us to decide and make more readily available, a system of learning to meet the lifelong needs of individuals.

Now all of us (and we are struggling with this thing all the time) in the military, government, industry, and institutions, themselves, have not been able to think seriously about higher education except in terms of the degree. The military, for example, requiring officers to have a degree, but yet knowing that officers wander sometimes all over the earth and have no real realistic way of getting a degree. Perhaps they should start looking more about how they can measure the accumulation of learning that an individual officer has had and see that he has appropriate promotional opportunities on the basis of what he has learned and not on the basis of some package or label that he has somehow been able to accumulate.

In government I am wondering with reference to the Civil Service Commission now, I know that in even one office of government, one arm does not necessarily know what the other one is doing. Was there any visible relationship between that phase or that aspect of the Civil Service Commission which developed into the governmental personnel act and those other aspects which work with the Continuing Education Unit? Should they not be brought together? Should the Civil Service Commission say yes? I believe that if the Civil Service Commission would say, for example, here is a system that we want to relate to the Inter-Governmental Personnel Act, and encourage institutions and promote the public image of this thing, it would give a tremendous lift to the whole CEU concept. And incidently, training of government personnel through the CEU will be about the best way I know of getting state support and financial support.

So, we need to pull these things together. It is not easy to do and it takes time. That is why it is so critical that what we begin to do with the CEU be taken with the greatest pains to do well. We may have here something which in the long perspective of time could emerge

as a discipline in its own right. That Continuing Education could then become a totally new format for the educational process, which could encompass and go beyond the much more limited degree concept. Let us not loose sight of these potentialities and what we may be able to do if we manage these things well.

DR. WILLIAM D. BARTON, UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

My question is directed to Mr. Al Stem. We have heard three or four good comments in a row now, and maybe my question is not needed, but you mentioned that one of your alternatives in setting up your plans for your program was to set up your own credit giving, degree giving institutionalized plan. Evidently, you chose not to do that as you mentioned. Do you now see that the use of the CEU doing the same type of thing instead of credit, or some of the programs that you are doing offering credit now, and some not, or just exactly how do you see the implication?

MR. AL STEM, STATE PERSONNEL, COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

Well, we are not offering credit at this point. This is a small program that is beginning and I think is growing. It was an experiment not only in a centralized coordinated grant funded training program for employees of government, but it was also an experiment in institutional cooperation. So much had to be done simply to pull this off and to get the institutions to work together in committee fashion to provide training programs for government employees that the step that we take beyond that is left only to the imagination. If your imagination says CEU, then this should possibly be considered. But we are growing now and we have a lot of other needs to meet at this point, and as Dean de Porry pointed out, it is down the road that we are going to keep our eyes open.

If we feel that there is a need that does exist, and I think it has been expressed that all of you feel there is, then there needs to be a vehicle to provide credit in some fashion or another to people who move around who cannot get off the job for eight weeks and six weeks or one year, and perhaps this is the answer. But we are a pilot program: we are in experimental stages now; we anticipate growth and the future is open, as I said, to imagination in this whole area.

DR. DON J. HERRMANN, COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY

The number of the speakers has caused a certain amount of confusion in my mind, so any one of them can volunteer to try to clarify it. I have heard any number of the speakers say that the great advantages of the CEU would be that it would add order to a great variety of unrelated continuing education experiences---make building blocks as I have heard a number of people say. I have not yet heard anybody give any indication of how a group of CEUs would become anymore than a bunch of unrelated building blocks. I wondered if anybody could help me with it.

DR. WILLIAM L. FLOWERS, VIRGINIA TECH

I think that the person who is nearest to the system and who has worked with this more is Grover Andrews. Grover, would you like to respond to this? He said that they are going to talk about that at the 11:00 A.M. session, so your question is well within the plan.

MR. C. CLARK JONES, CEC, VIRGINIA TECH

Don, we will put that in a hold pattern and try to answer that a little later if we can. I would like to shift our thinking now away from this particular compotent of the program into perhaps a more practical side, if you will. We are fortunate to have with us today a gentleman whose university was represented in the pilot program and actually has implemented the Continuing Education Unit. I think even more interesting and more a factor here is that this is a computerized system. Those of you who are employed by a large university are well aware that the logical way to implement the CEU is to use the computer in the compiling and the recalling of the data and information that is generated.

Our speaker is Dean G. E. Lorey. I would like to give you a little background on Dean Lorey. He was born in Brooklyn, New York, and was educated at the undergraduate and masters level at Alford University. He received his Ph.D. from Rutgers and I know that the representatives of Rutgers are quite proud of him, if they are in our audience. He is presently the Dean of Extension and Continuing Education and a professor in Ceramic Engineering at the University of Missouri in Rolla. I give you Dean Lorey.

DEAN G. E. LOREY, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI, ROLLA

Thank you. I generally request in any introduction that the audience be informed that I was born in Brooklyn because they generally have the feeling then that he cannot be all bad. Secondly, if I make some comments which do not strike you the right way, then say, "Well, he is from Brooklyn." I had two thoughts while walking up to the podium. (1.) Being next to last on the program, you may be expecting some unique ideas or a speech much more elegant than has already been presented to you. (2.) I am one of those non-adult education people, referred to by Ed Boone last night who has been moved from the resident portion of the university into Extension and Continuing Education. So with those two thoughts in mind, just sit back and expect what you will from my discussion.

Since 1968 when the National Task Force on the Continuing Education Unit was created, many of us here today have attended meetings and conferences where part of the time was spent discussing the CEU. There was the predictable dichotomy between those who liked the concept and wanted to get on with it and those who were questioning the need for this type of unit. There was generally sufficient depth to the discussion such that each side could find enough arguments to reinforce the position they held before attending the particular meeting. I would suggest that this conference at VPI has a different and, from my own viewpoint, a more pleasant and productive atmosphere. When an accrediting association decides that the CEU will be used to evaluate the institutional non-credit offerings and will become a part of the permanent records, this severely limits debate on whether or not the CEU has value.

The preliminary statement on the Continuing Education Unit prepared by the National Task Force in the spring of 1970 was primarily concerned with the benefit to the student - measurement, recording, reporting and recognition. This was of immediate interest to me since most of the extension programs at UMR related to continuing education for professionals. I felt that a uniform system for measuring an individual's progress in maintaining currency in his profession would be of extreme value to the adult student once this concept became known. Further, the advantages in using CEU for total institutional reporting were obvious. Valid comparisons of extension education among units within an institution and among institutions across the country were virtually impossible.

The University of Missouri had earlier adopted the student full-time equivalent method for reporting participation in Extension programs, but there is no nationwide standard for this type of calculation. We were using head count for national reporting as were most other universities, and, accepting the fact that nothing else was available, it was still a questionable practice. With duplicatory reporting and the inclusion of mass media, it was conceivable that your report would have an annual head count greater than the population of the state. This could lead to interesting discussions with the state legislature relative to budgeting but was not productive as a measure of the extent of education. The CEU thus offered great possibilities, and my discussion will be divided into the two general areas of student use and institutional use.

## Student Use

The National Task Force held a meeting in the summer of 1970 to initiate a pilot project on the CEU. Invited participants were requested to develop a permanent record system and to evaluate the suggested guidelines for implementation of this unit of measurement. Representing UMR at that meeting, it struck me that we were going to spend the next academic year evaluating an unknown concept which at that time had no marketable value. Nevertheless, I was convinced that the CEU would become accepted and used nationwide, that the guidelines were well enough developed such that experience would dictate only minor modifications, and that a computerized system for data storage and retrieval must be designed.

Passing over the revisions and modifications of the past two years, the current status of the CEU project at Rolla is as follows. The appropriate CEU value is assigned to every non-credit extension activity whether or not the program is selected for awarding CEUs to the registered students. For normal teaching situations (short courses, non-credit courses, conferences, and the like), there is no problem in assigning the number of CEUs for each program since the definition of the CEU is sufficient. For less formal modes of instruction (work experience or independent study), the CEU value assigned relates to the number of instructional hours required in a conventional classroom situation to achieve the same degree of knowledge transfer. This value is determined by the program planning committee members or, if none, the staff member directing the educational program since they or he are most familiar with the scope, content, participation and other forms of student exposure.

If CEUs are to be awarded to the students in a program, the same group or individual devises the system to determine that a participant has completed the program and is to be awarded the specified number of units. This is no great problem with small classroom situations but could easily become an administrative horror for large conferences. It is our feeling that CEUs should be awarded to all those whose names appear on the registration list for programs involving a large number of students. The ultimate value and/or utility of the CEU will be determined by the user (employer, accrediting agency, or other institution, for example) who is evaluating the continuing education progress of an individual. The user should place his own value on the educational return for someone attending a large conference or meeting.

Next, the program director, working with an extension coordinator, completes a program planning form. Most of the information on this form is used for internal management including the teaching staff, proposed budget and source of funds. The remainder of the information is intended for CEU application - name of course or program, program description, academic level, starting and ending dates, format, and the number of CEUs assigned. Also included is the Office of Education HEGIS code which uses the WICHE program classification system. If this program is one for which CEUs will be awarded, this remaining information

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI -- ROLLA

EXTENSION DIVISION

901 WEST 11TH STREET

ROLLA, MISSOURI 65401

THIS IS TO CERTIFY

THAT

KENNETH L. KUEBLER, 497-46-7646

HAS ATTENDED THE FOLLOWING CONTINUING EDUCATION

PROGRAM OFFERED BY THIS UNIVERSITY

| PROGRAM NAME | DESCRIPTION |
|---|---|
| COMPUTER METHODS OF OPTIMUM STRUCTURAL DESIGN | MATHEMATICAL FORMULATION, FORTRAN PROGRAMMING, AND COMPUTER SOLUTIONS OF STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS AND DESIGN PROBLEMS; USE OF PROGRAMS FOR SOLUTION OF PRACTICAL DESIGN PROBLEMS. |

| FORMAT | ACADEMIC LEVEL | ENROLLMENT | STARTING DATE | ENDING DATE | C. E. UNITS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SHORT COURSE | GRADUATE | 30 | 11/08/71 | 11/12/71 | 4.6 |

G. EDWIN LOREY
DEAN OF EXTENSION AND
CONTINUING EDUCATION

FIGURE 1. Computer Transcript for Student Participation in CEU Activity

TO: KENNETH L. KUEBLER
UNIVERSITY OF MO. ROLLA
26 WOODCREST
ROLLA, MISSOURI 65401

DEAR SIR:

TRANSCRIPTS OF YOUR CONTINUING EDUCATION UNITS
HAVE BEEN FORWARDED TO THE FOLLOWING ADDRESSEES.

G. EDWIN LOREY
EXTENSION DIVISION
501 WEST 11TH ST.
ROLLA, MISSOURI 65401

JOHN P. SOMEBODY
8054 W. LOCUST ST
THE HARTFORD BUILDING
SOMEWHERE, USA 66666

G. EDWIN LOREY
DEAN OF EXTENSION AND
CONTINUING EDUCATION

FIGURE 2. Computer Letter in Response to Student's Request for Transcript Transmittal

will be transferred at a later date to the computer for program identification. When the form is completed, it is signed by the program director and in turn by the chairman of the academic department responsible for the program, the school or college dean and the dean of extension, following the normal route for administrative approval. Copies of this form are made for all the administrative offices involved.

The awarding of CEUs to individual students participating in extension programs requires a formal registration. This form is completed in the normal block computer style and includes all the student information you might desire plus the social security number. Upon completion of the program, the program director signs this form if the student is to be awarded the appropriate CEUs. We primarily key the retrieval to the social security number, but in some cases this is not available so we have additional retrieval by name of registrant and geographic location or zip code. This information is also useful for print-out registration lists and future mailing information. We may also retrieve by HEGIS code for cumulative CEU data by academic discipline, although these data are more applicable to institutional reporting than the awarding of CEUs.

For our CEU program, we are presently using an IBM 360/50 computer with a direct access device, either a disc or drum. Each disc pack is capable of storing complete information for 150,000 students. The program is written in PL1 but may readily be changed at nominal cost into another programming language. We mail one transcript to the student as part of the cost of the program. Figure 1 is an actual transcript printed by the computer for one of our short courses presented this academic year. (Facing Page) We have included what we hope is enough information to enable the user to make an intelligent evaluation of the continuing education progress of an individual. If desired, the computer will supply a transcript showing a cumulative record to date of all the courses presented by our university attended by a particular student.

If at a later date the student requests that transcripts be forwarded to specific organizations or individuals, the computer will respond as shown in Figure 2. (Facing Page) This letter informs Mr. Kuebler that his CEU records have been sent to the named individuals as requested. The computer also supplies the necessary two transcripts with gummed mailing labels for the two individuals plus a mailing label for Mr. Kuebler's letter. We plan to charge the student for this particular service.

According to our Computer Center, the direct cost for the initial entry of student and program information with a single transcript retrieval plus mailing (which is more than half the cost) is $40 per 100 students. This cost we plan as part of the program budget. A student would be charged $2.50 for a single retrieval request as shown in Figure 2, but this charge could be reduced if a number of requests were processed at the same time. There is an obvious economic advantage for a large records repository receiving numerous requests for processing at periodic intervals.

## Institutional Use

The University of Missouri Extension Division (four campuses and the field staff) is currently using a computerized reporting system to record extension plans and activities for each fiscal year. This extension management information system was implemented on July 1, 1969, following the guidelines developed by the U. S. Department of Agriculture. This system was required only for Federal Cooperative Extension Services, but it was decided in Missouri that all units of the Extension Division would participate in the programs. The system is identified as MEMIS, the Missouri Extension Management Information System.

Since MEMIS was developed over three years ago, it is not programmed for CEU output. However, the raw data suitable for CEU (student teaching hours) are stored for retrieval in terms of student full-time equivalents, and the system could be modified for CEUs. A committee is presently evaluating MEMIS with respect to the new requests from the Office of Education for its HEGIS report, the NUEA annual report, and the CEU application. The fiscal year 1973-74 is the target date for revision of MEMIS to incorporate the additional storage and retrieval. At present, UMR is the only unit of the University using CEU for its programs since we were part of the nationwide pilot project. The procedures that I discussed earlier have been recommended to the MEMIS evaluating committee for University-Wide application.

In addition, we use a final program report for each UMR extension activity developed in a manner similar to that discussed for the program planning form. Again for management purposes, we include the actual expenditures and income for the program, academic and non-academic effort, cost per student full-time equivalent, and the total CEUs (awarded or not). We hand collate the last item by HEGIS code, academic level, and format for our campus institutional report. Hopefully, the MEMIS revision will take care of this in the future for the entire Extension Division.

We have had discussions with the four Registrars and the Institutional Research personnel of the University relative to the administrative responsibility for recording and reporting student participation in credit and non-credit programs. The present consensus is that the Registrars will continue to have responsibility for credit course transcripts for both resident and extension students while the Extension Division will maintain the records and reports for non-credit activities. This decision is not at all critical for the success of total institutional reporting since all data storage and retrieval could be handled satisfactorily through one administrative unit.

## National Records Repository

As a final thought, I was pleased to learn that the National Task Force is studying the possibility of a national records repository for the CEU. For each CEU program presented at Rolla, I have met with the students to discuss this new concept and its application. The reception was excellent, and with very few exceptions the students wanted their records established, but one question kept reoccurring. "At some time in the future, how may I easily obtain my CEU records from the various institutions across the country that I might attend?"

There are several possibilities, the least desirable of which would require the student to obtain separate records from each institution he attended. If enough universities implement record keeping for the CEU, the student might designate one (possibly where he obtained his last degree) as his central record keeper and upon completion of CEU programs at other institutions request that records be sent to that predetermined location.

If a national repository were established, other possibilities exist. Every institution presenting CEU programs could automatically send detailed student transcripts to the repository for storage and retrieval upon student request. Since I feel that most universities will want to maintain fairly detailed records of their own activities, it is possible that a simple machine readable record could be transmitted to the repository from each institution. When the repository is queried by a student, this would trigger requests to the appropriate institutions which in turn would send complete transcripts to the student. Other suggestions will certainly be proposed, but the procedure for student use of the CEU should be kept as simple as possible.

Establishing and implementing a new system for program reporting and student participation records involves more time, effort and paper work than we want to consider. Day-to-day operations continually require more data. With the recent addition of EEO, Affirmative Action and several others as yet unnamed, I feel that soon we will have 51% of university personnel collecting and analyzing data from the programs generated by the remaining 49%, if in fact we have not already reached that state. However, I feel the end result of the Continuing Education Unit and its application is worth the extra effort and hope we will continue to expand its implementation.

Discussion Session

MR. C. CLARK JONES, CEC, VIRGINIA TECH

If there are questions to be directed at Dean Lorey, we will take those now.

RONALD BUTLER, FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY

As many of you know, our institution will open in the fall of 1972. My position is University Registrar and I am here with one of our Continuing Education Deans to get a first hand impression on the CEU because we want to complete our permanent records system with this in mind. Dean Lorey has given us an example of a permanent record or a transcript that will be maintained by the Continuing Education Unit. One thing we have decided at this point is that there will be one permanent record at the institution to include credit and non-credit work. Now, when you go into having one type of transcript, I have considered some of the suggestions that have been made by the National Task Force. But, you cannot seriously implement some of those suggestions, and I have one question about several of them.

During the conference I have been sitting here wondering how I would put this on one transcript realizing several things. Number (1) - You will not have many of your regular students taking CEUs. I mean this will happen but it will not happen while they are working for degrees. But the student probably will leave and in five years come back and you have to have a way to retrieve this and get it all on one record. So, I do not want to go into course description. This alone would just kill a permanent record. We do not do it for regular class work, so why should we do it for continuing education work? A descriptive course title is about the best you could do, and I will not relate to what the Task Force has said about personnel information about the student, name of the instructor, the evaluation of each individual's performance, the cooperating sponsor, and that sort of thing. If you are going to use it on one transcript and it is going to be the same as the regular university transcript, some of that has to go. You have eliminated some of that and so did the University System in Georgia, although they still maintain the description.

Just to share with you what I have jotted down, I think we can get by with approximately three short lines. And I would enter this on the transcript something like this:

CEU Course: Dates 9-27-72, 10-27-72

Instructor: (Although I do not really think this is important, I will give it a point and say . . .)
J. J. Hansen

Format: Seminar

Course Title: Hot Air Heating and Cooling

Credit: 5 CEUs

To me, this is a possible solution where you are going to use one transcript at an institution, and I just made that comment. I do not have any particular questions. If we are going to have two, yours is a very good way to go.

DEAN G. E. LOREY, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI, ROLLA

Well, I agree with you. If you have only one record, you are going to have the same difficulty. I suggest that you leave the record to a decision that there would be two because I feel that there is more information required for this type of a program than your credit course, and because you have a catalog, you do not put down on there what instructor taught the course for a credit course. I see no reason for this on the CEU record, but we do have it in our office. I want to ask Keith Glancy of the Task Force, what do they mean by permanent and how long is a permanent record? I suspect resident students die and the records are still there in the University. You are keeping a lot of information in your office and elsewhere.

DR. KEITH GLANCY, JOHN HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

The definition of permanent, of course, can be somewhat varied but the general idea was that it would be as permanent as the credit records, and this would be particularly true if you were able to use the same transcript for recording, then you would treat that transcript as you do now. When the student died, you would put it in the dead files. Other than that, there has been some argument that continuing education may not be valuable as a record after five years. I doubt that that is anymore valid than saying a degree is not valid after five years. It may well not be, but we are not quite ready to admit it yet.

LEWIS PHILLIPS, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA, ATHENS

Two or three questions and a comment. What types of numbers are you dealing with on a yearly basis in your record's system?

DEAN G. E. LOREY, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI, ROLLA

We are dealing with the courses we have handled this year. There will be about 43 short courses of about five days duration, average attendance of about 30. So, there is not very many at this time. That is why we were chosen to evaluate this, too, because we have a fairly small number of students at hand.

LEWIS PHILLIPS, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA, ATHENS

Alright, now what kind of turn around time from the time that you initiate a request for record, do you get it back or is mailed out?

DEAN G. E. LOREY, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI, ROLLA

We have varying priorities on requests, and if we are taking the normal, say the average priority request, it will take us about a day.

LEWIS PHILLIPS, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA, ATHENS

Now, you have given us some cost figures here, but how about your initial equipment, your disc, disc storage unit, and this kind of thing?

DEAN G. E. LOREY, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI, ROLLA

Well, a disc pack is about $350.00, but what I am assuming is that you have a computer center with this in personnel. But if you are just starting, don't ask me the cost.

LEWIS PHILLIPS, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA, ATHENS

Let me make some comments here in terms of the initial cost factors. I think this is extremely important in talking about the continuity of records. One thing you have got to remember about the CEU is that you have got a record system of continuous input. Normally on a quarter or semester basis, you gear up and you gear down at the beginning and ending of a quarter and when you get to this kind of a system, you have got to have a system that you can get continuous input and continuous output on a very short notice. Now, we are dealing with a system where we register about 100,000 people a year in our Center and throughout our operations. We estimate that between 40,000 and 50,000 of these per year will have CEU records. Now, I commend you on your approach on what you have done so far, but one thing I would like to mention to the group is do not overlook the uses of microfilm in this kind of a system. So far as in terms of initial outlay, initial personnel, and investment in equipment, the microfilm can provide you a great deal of flexibility in record keeping in which you can train one secretary almost to coordinate and provide you with retrieval services, you could have it where almost anyone could go in and pull out the record he needs. Now, about our plans in utilizing microfilm---we realize that this might be good for five years, but we realize their limitations and we may have to convert, but do not forget also that now they can convert microfilm into magnetic tape likewise. We are planning to utilize microfilm and also to microfilm all of our brochures, our requests, and our evaluation information so that we will have for our institutional use, a great deal of information in our system. Microfilm is just like a filing cabinet. You can put anything into it you want. Now, for the real key to a microfilm system---if you have to make changes in it, say in your index system, and if you do not index microfilm, it really doesn't mean anything to you, because if you have an error, you have to go back in and correct if and you have no way to relocate your information. So I just want to mention this to the group---that there are a lot of possibilities with microfilm.

DEAN G. E. LOREY, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI, ROLLA

Are you referring to microfiche?

LEWIS PHILLIPS, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA, ATHENS

Microfiche or microfilm, it really doesn't matter. We were going to use microfilm on the reels.

DEAN G. E. LOREY, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI, ROLLA

When I first heard of microfiche, I thought they were describing a type of trout I caught. We use a direct access. We have a terminal in our office and we type this directly into the computer. It saves us many transfer steps. We get out registration lists and we get all of this out of one input. I understand your problem with 40,000 or 50,000 students, and I certainly can appreciate that, but you still have to put it down someway through a typewriter.

LEWIS PHILLIPS, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA, ATHENS

One thing I failed to mention, now, for statistical purposes, we will be using a computer. We have our own unit record equipment and sorter in which you can do a great deal yourself, and we plan to utilize this to help control the microfilm system for statistical reporting on a quarterly and annual basis.

DEAN G. E. LOREY, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI, ROLLA

Well, I suggest I have a failing. When it is a good idea, I like to get as much out of it as possible; if not more than the idea will stand. I think this is the way I am approaching the CEU also, but with the computer I try to get as much out of it as possible with one input. Now, this may not be possible in all of these cases.

MADISON E. WEIDNER, RUTGERS UNIVERSITY, EXTENSION DIVISION

I happen to have the microphone again, but what has concerned me in connection with the pilot was this course description. We are still on the manual system of record keeping, and we are a little behind the times in New Jersey. We are studying the potentials of the computer. However, it would seem to me that for anyone who is interested in a student's record, what he is concerned with is a verification that he took some course or program, and if there is an evaluation, that evaluation was pass, fail, a grade, or whatever it is. Now, if we might tie in what Andre de Porry said last night, I believe it was about what we had called report cards. We send out a grade report each year and each semester. Those who do not get a grade report get a certificate. On the certificate if a grade was given, we will show it. We will probably have to standardize this and keep them with what Andre had suggested. However, would not the description be part of what we give the student---perhaps which, he keeps for someone who is evaluating it at a later date? Or, if the student has a brochure, we will have to orient students that if they want to take this seriously, they will have to keep some of the records themselves. I think it is a lot better to have a student take some responsibility in this, but we must still provide some verification that he did something between certain dates. It may be about all we can keep permanently. This is just my thinking at the moment on it.

DEAN G. E. LOREY, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI, ROLLA

I agree with the idea. We have had in mind, of course, some way of adding additions. If for example, this particular short course I was showing had been requested by a student to be part of this new professional development degree offered by the University of Wisconsin which requires some sort of a proficiency examination, it may be that if this were the case, we might have after the course description, an efficiency examination required, and passed, or some comment.

MADISON E. WEIDNER, RUTGERS UNIVERSITY, EXTENSION DIVISION

This is true.

DEAN G. E. LOREY, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI, ROLLA

Because it is going to vary around. The application of these is going to be quite varied as to whether the governmental unit is interested in having some evidence of knowledge increase. You know, it all depends on the user again. Now, I do not know how we stay flexible enough to do all these things. I appreciate what you are saying. I am not really overly happy. What I am going to do, you see, since we have developed it, is that I am going to give it to somebody else to handle. I do not have any pride in authorship at all. Let somebody else handle it within the University.

DR. KEITH GLANCY, JOHN HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

I would like to comment a little bit on the Task Force point of view on course descriptions. The feeling was very definite that the user of the record needs some indication of what the course was about. Now in credit courses, we do have a catalog that we can refer to, and whether you know it or not, they are referred to in many, many cases to get a description of the course. I am quite perturbed really when you talk about discarding the course description. You are, at that point, making the administration of the program a primary and the student and the user, secondary. The idea of this is to give something to the student and the user. Now, an alternative when you have a limitation on what is going on an individual transcript is to have a supplemental course description, and you may have a copy of a particular course that is on that transcript to accompany it. I think that would be quite feasible and I think getting a copy is not particularly difficult if you have this on file. I think that would be a much better approach rather than saying, "Let's not give a description. Let them guess what was in it."

MR. C. CLARK JONES, CEC, VIRGINIA TECH

At this point, we will stand recessed.

## Session III

MR. RICHARD H. FOSTER, CEC, VIRGINIA TECH

My name is Richard Foster. I am Associate Director here at the Continuing Education Center and I work primarily in the field of administration. I hope you have enjoyed your stay here and I hope you have found the accommodations sufficient.

When the program developers were working on this conference, they felt they needed some input from a particular person, Dr. R. J. Pitchell. I think probably a lot of you know him. He is the Executive Director for the National University Extension Association. As most of you know, they will be holding their annual meeting starting today at the University of South Carolina. Dr. Pitchell is not here. He is attending meetings in Columbia. We worked on several plans for getting him here. It would have required a chartered jet, practically, to have gotten him in to make a short speech and get back to the events he has to attend at Columbia, South Carolina. We use video tape quite a bit here. I do want to point out that Dr. Pitchell felt it was important that he come to this Center, and he was at this Continuing Education Center Monday and Tuesday. He had with him one of his assistants, Mr. Lou Lantner, and we cut a tape, video tape, for presentation to you at this time. So you will be seeing Dr. R. J. Pitchell, Bob Pitchell, who is the Executive Director for the National University Extension Association.

DR. ROBERT J. PITCHELL, EXTENSION DIRECTOR, NUEA

Friends and colleagues, there are a couple of serious disadvantages in using this technique -- one for you and one for me. If video taping was not available, I would not be here and that probably would be a great advantage for you and the conference. The disadvantage for me is that I cannot react to you right now. I cannot tell whether you are spirited, alert, alive, happy, eager or bored and unresponsive. Be that as it may and hopefully that you have been excited and spirited by the previous sessions and assuming that during the course of the previous sessions not too much was said about my program topic, "Criteria for Handbook," I will proceed.

Actually, this session should be called "getting down to the 'nitty-gritty'" because after all of the hosannas and the glorias in excelsis and all of the hurrahs that might have been sung at this meeting and in the work of the National Task Force and the Southern Association, at a given point we must get down to the practical problems of applying the unit.

There is no doubt in my mind that the people out in the field are more than ready for the implementation process to begin. How do we do it? Well, we could let the Southern Association do all the work of preparing the handbook, testing it out, and if it proves workable, put our support behind its national adoption and actually that might be the process which will actually take place. But I have assumed in coming here that we all ought to have some inputs; that it is desirable we have some inputs from people who have been working at the Washington level and people who have been working out in the field nationally and other parts of the country; that we have come to make some suggestions, some proposals and assist in thinking through the critical problems that lie ahead. So with that as an assumption, allow me to make some suggestions, whether the Southern Association has to go it alone in the early stages or whether there will be total national inputs from around the country into preparation of the handbook. Let me make some suggestions about how we might go about it and what kinds of critical problems we are going to face in developing a handbook which will carry out the purpose of this total effort.

One of the most important purposes is to produce a uniform unit of measurement for non-credit continuing education programs. Right on the brochure we have produced has been the name of the game from the very beginning, "A Uniform Unit of Measurement." Clearly, we cannot delegate to every producing unit, every producing institution, the authority or the right to simply award units as they see fit in accordance with whatever criteria they wish to utilize. We must develop criteria and standards that can be accepted, utilized, and translated into actual operating units at institutions of many types in many parts of the country. To do this I think we must follow one primary rule, one primary criterion. All the criteria we use must be sufficiently clear and standardized to make Continuing Education Units awarded by different institutions comparable, but they must have some built in flexibility to enable awarding institutions some leeway in dealing with special institutional conditions. Now while that might seem self-evident, I

think it is terribly important that we articulate it and keep it in the back of our minds.

The adoption of a national handbook (standards, criteria) really has to be built around the definition which was adopted by the National Task Force. The Continuing Education Unit is defined as follows: 10 contact hours of participation in an organized continuing education experience, under responsible sponsorship, capable direction and qualified instruction. Let us look at the various elements in that definition.

In defining these criteria we will have a critical problem of applying the definitions to programs of non-accredited proprietary institutions and to in-service and non-traditional study activities and work experiences. These will be the critical problem areas as we go along and I will get into them in somewhat more detail at the end of this presentation.

Contact Hour. Most of us know what this means, but I think it is in this part of the definition that we must have a degree of flexibility as well as a degree of uniformity. In some places the actual hour of instruction is 45 minutes, in some places it is 50 minutes, and even in some places it is 60 minutes. On some occasions the program will run for two hours or three hours steadily before a break, and then for another two or three hours. In developing these standards in the handbook that there be some allowance for flexibility, particularly when it centers around a single hour of instruction.

The basic problem in dealing with the contact hour is how to count independent study, field trips, laboratory work. We have had some experience with this in the past and I believe we ought to utilize our experience in assigning credit hours to laboratory work, independent study, and field trips in applying or in determining how to award contact hours and the CEU (Continuing Education Unit) in non-credit activities.

The heart of our handbook really has to concern itself with what we mean by an organized continuing education experience. I would like to attempt to come to grips with this in terms of: first, the level of experience or the level of instruction for the learning experience and then second, what is to be excluded and third, what is to be included.

Level of instruction should be relatively easy for the work done by institutions of higher education and for work done at secondary educational levels. We can start our analysis by dividing our work, or our learning experience into secondary, baccalaureate (with baccalaureate further divided into lower division, upper division and graduate), and finally, post-doctoral which will be largely for the medical and science professionals. How do we apply this, however, to the non-academic institutions? I think a real effort must be made to so define these levels so that they can be applied outside of the academic world as well as inside. In both cases, both within and outside the formal academic world, the great difficulty will come where we have mixed audiences; mixed clientele; clientele who are assembled without regard to whether they have equivalent prior education at the

secondary, baccalaureate, or graduate level. Our answer has to be the level in instruction that is proposed by the conference program chairman and particularly by the instructor.

The most meaningful criteria will have to deal with the exclusions and the inclusions as to what we mean by an organized continuing education experience.

Allow me to start with the excluded items. First, I would exclude annual meeting type conferences of all kinds of organizations, including NUEA and other national associations, except the formal workshops and seminars that are associated with such annual type conferences, especially where they have separate registrations. We have to exclude all kinds of convention activities which make no pretense at having any kind of an organized learning experience. We ought to exclude all kinds of committe meetings no matter how educational they are for those participating, whether organizational committees or national committee meetings. For example, the Task Force on the Uniform Unit of Measurement was a highly educational experience for those who participated in it, but I do not think the participants ought to have been awarded Continuing Education Units for their work on that committee. It was not intended to be an educational learning experience as such. It was intended to have other goals and objectives.

Second, we should exclude all kinds of informal sessions, from the more obvious informal sessions like bull sessions to the less obvious informal sessions in which people at conferences do get together in non-organized ways and communicate with each other very meaningfully, perhaps, but without any pre-planning, without any special efforts to make a learning experience out of it. We should clearly not include those, no matter how much from a post-hoc view it looks as though one could evaluate it as a learning experience.

Third, in a very controversial area today, I would like to suggest that we deal very strictly with work experiences, including apprenticeship type situations. It is becoming the vogue today to give credit for work experiences. I hope we can avoid that track in the Continuing Education Unit. I hope we can take a hard line with regard to it. As an example, all of us or most of us have gone down the Teaching Assistantship route to get our degrees. During the course of that experience, I do not think any of us got credit for work-oriented experience of that type. We got paid for it, however miserly, but it was not a formal organized learning situation. It was an apprenticeship type situation not worthy of formal academic credit, it should no more be worthy of informal continuing education unit credit.

Fourth, a similar type of difficulty arises with regard to in-service training programs. There is an enormous amount of confusion in this country, has been, is now, and will continue to be with regard to the classification of in-service type learning. Every organization indulges in and must engage in some kind of in-service type education. There are five employees in the NUEA Washington office. We have in-service type education, sometimes with everybody sitting around the table and sometimes on an individual basis and sometimes in other ways.

I do not think that such experiences, however valuable from the point of view of the organization or the individual, ought to be awarded either credits, academic credits, or Continuing Education Units. It is a very difficult area. I think a great deal of work has to be expended on defining these areas, what comes in and what goes out, but I would suggest one criteria: that for post-secondary education all kinds of in-service training programs be excluded from CEU consideration. For secondary education, most organized in-service training programs, where there is a qualified instructor involved should be included. I am sure this area will be highly controversial. I am almost certain that if I were physically present you might come at me with more than just words, but I would like to pose that as one of the critical problem areas if we are to make the Continuing Education Unit meaningful. If all kinds of in-service training programs are to be awarded Continuing Education Units, I can just see the proliferation of CEU's by the hundreds of thousands because most of us do get exposed regularly and persistently to this type of experience in our occupational activities.

Fifth, I would like to suggest that research efforts be excluded except those that are integral parts of the instructional process. When a research paper is made a condition of activity or participation in a given learning experience, obviously, this should be included in the scope of awarding Continuing Education Units. But the individual research efforts by people, on projects or project proposals, are not in my judgement part of the learning process we are talking about in non-credit continuing education.

Sixth, all kinds of orientation programs ought to be excluded. Things happen so fast these days that almost every organization of any size at some time or another gathers all of its employees together to discuss a new personnel system or the new TIAA retirement system or whatever, or has some session to which everyone is invited. Since most of the sessions are short and probably would be excluded anyhow, we do not really have a problem. But in some cases, as with PPBS which has swept the country in the last couple of years, many sessions last far longer than that. In my judgement these ought not to be included in the awarding of Continuing Education Units.

Seventh, all kinds of interest group assemblies for policy-making purposes ought to be excluded. When NUEA's Governmental Relations Committee meets for two days or when our View-of-the-Future Committee meets for two days, some of that activity produces a magnificent learning experience for the participants. But, they are policy making units and while perhaps they have the side effect of producing an educational experience, it seems to me that their prime purpose is somewhat different from an educational experience and they ought not to be eligible for Continuing Education Units. Otherwise all congressional activities, all state legislative activities, all academic senate activities, etc., etc., could and should be eligible. Obviously, we have to draw the line some place.

Eighth, general broadcast TV, unless associated with independent study, ought to be excluded. A very important part of my continuing education takes place on Sunday mornings or early afternoons. I listen to the talk shows, the intellectual talk shows, such as Face the Nation and Issues and Answers. I do not think I ought to be awarded Continuing Education Units for that type of general broadcast. Many of us listen to various kinds of programs high in educational content on educational TV. I do not think we ought to be awarded Continuing Education Units for certifying that we listened to these or even for doing it in some session unless all of the other elements of the definition are involved in it, i.e., qualified instructor is there, there is additional participation, and there are responses and inputs from instructor and students. In other words, as an aid to an organized learning experience, fine; all by themselves, they ought not to be included in my judgement.

Ninth, we must consider unsupervised reading experiences. Reading the Great Books on one's own time is one of the great learning experiences one can have. Many of us who got in this habit at given times in our lives found that we advanced dramatically in our capacities to think and to continue to learn. But I do not think that we ought to open up that gate. Courses in the Great Books with a qualified instructor, fine. Just coming in and certifying that you have read Plato and Aristotle, Hobbs and Locke, are not adequate, in my judgement, for awarding of CEU's.

Tenth, all kinds of library work ought to be excluded except as it relates to the study of library science and, of course, except as it relates to an organized learning experience. If you go to the library, read books and do research as part of an organized learning experience, then obviously it becomes part of the potential for awarding CEU's.

Eleventh, almost every institution worth its salt these days or at least those who have large enough potential clientele within the campus or local area produces some kind of a general lecture or music or entertainment series. I do not think such activities ought to qualify for Continuing Education Units in spite of the fact that in many cases there is a competent person giving the lecture. In most cases they would not qualify because of the shortness of the time involved, but even if they should go over say a minimum of three hours, it would seem to me that they largely are in the realm of entertainment and not the organized learning experience we are talking about.

Those are the main items I believe that we ought to articulate clearly as excluded items or consider clearly as possible excluded items in the handbook which is to be produced. Let us examine then some of the included items.

First, all kinds of formal classroom instruction with a qualified instructor and competent administration including workshops, institutes, seminars, and independent study in accordance with a prescribed course of study. Independent study includes, obviously, correspondence study as well as other kinds of independent study, which is carried out in accordance with a prescribed course study. Also to be included are

field trips under the supervision of qualified instructors; a practicum under supervision of qualified instructors; laboratory work under similar supervision; closed circuit TV and telenetwork presentations of educational material prepared by qualified instructors especially where there are response capabilities from the students to the instructor. These are the primary forms of included items.

As we look at both the excluded and the included, it seems to me that our most difficult problems will center on in-service training as already mentioned, on work experiences, on non-traditional study and on independent study. Which do we include, which do we exclude, and what are the bases for inclusion and exclusion?

In general, as I have indicated prior to this point, I would say that because of the nature of the non-credit learning experience we should be stricter and tighter in our criteria rather than looser. The potential for abuse is so great if we make it too easy for non-credit Continuing Education Units to be awarded that I personally feel the whole system would go down the drain. There will be scandals associated with it if we are not careful. It is a lot easier in some respects to give regular academic credit for non-traditional study because you have the accoutrement of tests and other established procedures to assist you in evaluating the degree of learning that takes place, than it is non-credit study where you do not have the means for testing. I believe that this problem magnifies as we get outside of the formal academic institutions. The experiences under the Veteran's GI Bill and other experiences outside of the accredited academic institutions are sufficient for us to take this as a warning about building our criteria at a low level of rigidity or strictness with regard to the need for excluding those which cannot in any way be evaluated by people on the scene or by much more informal means than the accrediting process.

Nevertheless, when we look at some of the other elements of the definition, we come head-on into the whole question of accrediting or central listing. For example, there must be responsible sponsorship. Well, we do not have any difficulty on that when we are talking about accredited universities and colleges. They are responsible sponsors. What about other groups, how do we determine whether Company X and whether Institute Y is a responsible sponsor? How do we determine whether there is capable direction? I really wish we had not had that term in the definition. I really do not know how to deal with it, except through a formal accrediting technique. Capable direction on any given course is exceedingly difficult to determine; we can determine responsible sponsorship much more easily.

Qualified instruction -- that is a lot easier to determine than capable direction, too. But in each of these we face very difficult problems when we get outside of the academic community. What do we mean by qualified instruction? How do we determine the criteria? My own judgement is that there is no way, no meaningful way, of dealing with this except through some type of accrediting system. It does not

have to be as elaborate as the formal accrediting of major universities and colleges in this country. But certainly some type of central listing of institutions which can demonstrate accountability must be developed, whether it be through the NUEA visitation type system, or some other relatively easy way of approaching it. We need to determine in advance those organizations that have proven that they can give capable direction, that they are responsible sponsors and that they do build into their systems qualified instructors. Without that, we are going to have extremely difficult problems in determining what Continuing Education Units are to be accepted and meaningful and which ones are not.

And that brings us up to the final question I think that needs to be dealt with in the handbook. It relates to the accrediting or central listing problem. The handbook ought to contain some kind of coding system for reporting and record keeping. Many of these matters are spelled out in the Interim report and I need not repeat them here. They can be easily reviewed by you and by whoever is going to get to work on the handbook. But in my judgement, the coding system has to conform to a projected need for a central record keeping function and, therefore, it has to be computer oriented. It has to conform to the requirements of computer systems because it will not be possible to have a national record keeping center for Continuing Education Units which is not computerized. Most of us are aware that considerable thought has been given to that problem, discussions have been held already and it may be that this will become a reality before too long. But in any case, I believe that whoever develops the handbook must look at the question of dealing with the coding problem and dealing with it in terms of a prospective national record keeping center.

I said that the last point was the final point, but there really is no final point. It is wide open for consideration of many other possible needs. I think those of you out in the field, who participated in the pilot studies or who are working in the field of non-credit continuing education every day might easily come up with a half a dozen other areas which really need to be considered seriously as elements of the handbook. But to me there is no doubt whatsoever that a handbook is essential and the handbook must deal with the critical elements in the definition plus whatever other elements it is felt from the operational point of view would be desirable to assist you in awarding Continuing Education Units.

I wish to thank Jerry Hargis for the opportunity to give my views on this matter through this medium. Thank you, Jerry, Bill Skelton, and Bill Flowers and the sponsors of the conference.

MR. RICHARD FOSTER, CEC, VIRGINIA TECH

On behalf of the Donaldson Brown Center for Continuing Education, I would like to thank Dr. Pitchell for coming here and for recording this presentation to be made to you. And how would you like to follow that?

We have with us this morning Dr. Grover Andrews and he is well qualified to follow Dr. Pitchell. Dr. Andrews will introduce the panel discussion -- Dr. Andrews. While he is coming up, I would like to say that he was the Director for Study of Standards on Standard IX, and he is Assistant to the Director of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

DR. GROVER ANDREWS, SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS

I would like to stand here for just a minute and thank you, for I know there was great rivalry between V.P.I. and North Carolina State University, and I appreciate V.P.I. awarding me my doctorate two weeks ahead of North Carolina State's graduation.

We want to take a few minutes to maybe recapsule a study that brought about the Standard and some facts that are of perhaps interest to you just very briefly and then we want the termination of this conference to be in your hands. The panel will come and we will answer questions. We will present the model and answer questions that you have about the implementation of the Continuing Education Unit.

I think you will be interested in knowing this. The study that produced this Standard IX, which the CEU was incorporated into, was conducted with all of the member institutions of the Southern Association -- 560 at the time of the study. We had responses with follow-up procedures from all of the institutions. That is one thing about a study being conducted by an accrediting association, I guess. You get 100 percent response. Of the responding institutions, 415 of the 560, or 74 percent, were involved in some type of adult and continuing education activity. Two-hundred twenty eight of these had identifiable administrative units. In other words they were somewhat organized. One-hundred eighty seven had these activities spread out through the university and being conducted by some other department than an Extension Division. Of course, that leaves 145 institutions that were not involved at all.

We found that from the study, the volume was really more than we had anticipated. There were nine specific areas that people were involved in -- late afternoon and evening colleges, 142; off-campus academic programs, 138; conferences, workshops, and institutes, 203; self-directed study programs, 59; compensatory education, 86; cultural and Richmond activities, 147; inter-disciplinary institutes and Centers, 36; resource referral services, 26; and foreign travel study, 29. There were 31 institutions that listed other types of programs, each one being somewhat different.

The one major program area, just to focus briefly that will be of interest to you because this represents a bulk of the non-credit activities is the conferences, workshops, and institutes. That one year, academic year, within the Southern Association territory and the member institutions, there were 16,815 conferences and workshops conducted. There were 570,150 people enrolled, and we were looking a little bit earlier about where the people came from. The majority of them came from the local area of the institution. The question was asked, "How many came?" You remember earlier I said not too many were served by or not many of the participants were regular students. Well, 32,965 of these were regular students who were participating in non-credit activities on their campus. The local area, as I said, the institutions we were serving accounted for 76 percent of the people involved.

I think this is just to give you a little bit of the data and the background, and the full report on the study is 180 pages long. I will not read it to you. We do hope to have a digest of it in printed form before too long which some of you may like to have.

I would like to ask the members of the panel to come to the platform if they would and we will tell you then about these folks and their role here and the role we hope you will play. While they are getting settled, there are a few people here I think you really ought to know, and I would like to introduce these folks to you. There are three gentlemen right here in the front -- Andre de Porry. Stand up Andre, they know you. Also, Lionel Pellegrin and R. D. Johnson. This is Kentucky, Louisiana, and Virginia. These folks were on the Standard IX Revision Committee and we have two other people here who were on that committee-- Bill Turner and Ed Boone, speakers yesterday. So you see, five of the folks who helped on this have been willing to come and help us solve some of the problems.

I think that probably the most important development since the Standard was adopted and the Continuing Education Unit was made a part of it has been the reaction that our institutions have made, and the reaction of one particular group, the University System of Georgia.

Shortly after the Standard was adopted, the University System appointed an ad hoc committee to explore the implication of a new standard and the Continuing Education Unit. This committee began to work and they realized they needed two special sub-committees---one to work specifically on the Continuing Education Unit and one on the external degree. The Continuing Education Unit plan has been developed. We have met with them and worked with them to have the Southern Association input because we wanted this to be one model that you folks could react to and other members of the Southern Association could react to. John Rhodes at the far end is Chairman of the ad hoc committee. John is the Director of Public Service at Georgia State University. I want to introduce at this time, too, a gentleman who was really the power behind the magnificant work and plan that the University System of Georgia has done -- Dr. Howard Gordon, Vice-Chairman of the University System. Stand and let them see you. We appreciate him coming up here. He has been here for the whole conference and he gave the support that was needed as the Vice-Chancellor to this committee and these committees.

Next, we have Barry Mellinger from our own staff, Associate Executive Secretary, College Commission, and then Keith Glancy from the National Task Force from Johns Hopkins University. I am going to ask each of these starting with Keith to say just a word about their particular role. I know each has something to say, and then we will end with John Rhodes who will present the Georgia Plan, which you have and which I hope you have read. He has with him other members of the Georgia System. We hope they can answer any question that you have about their plan and any question about the Southern Association. At the conclusion, I will have a few things to say perhaps about the future and the Southern Association's involvement.

DR. KEITH GLANCY, JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

All I am going to do is find out if this microphone is on. It is--good. I will pass it on to the next one because I think I would do better answering questions than giving any comments at this point.

MR. BARRY MELLINGER, SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS

I probably ought to second that, but I want to say one or two things. Our time is almost gone and I think the best use of what we have left can be focused on what the University of Georgia System has developed. Somebody mentioned the nuts and bolts of implementing this whole process, and I think if we could focus the rest of our time on that, it would be very important. I think we have said a lot of things about CEU during this conference that probably needed to be said. I think we have said some things not really knowing what we have said in some instances. I think we need to define our terms in many cases when we are talking about some of these things, but I think this needs to be said.

The Southern Association, as a regional accrediting agency, has in principle, adopted the use of the CEU as a means for recording the non-credit types of educational experiences. It has not developed a detailed guide for institutions to follow in developing record keeping systems and in the establishment of criteria for awarding CEU, etc. I think Mr. Sweet got into this just a little bit yesterday. It is not the commission's role, we think, to take this kind of posture. It is more that of saying in principle this is a sound approach. Now you develop a procedure that fits your situation. We then will look at this procedure in view of its effectiveness and will react. If something is wrong, then the accrediting agency can make some suggestions for improvement of that procedure. As for accreditation, we have learned to rely upon the integrity of the institution.

We think that our member institutions will continue their integrity with non-credit work in awarding CEU credits just as we think they have in awarding credit for the kinds of credit activities over the years. So I think this, in effect, is the posture of the commission, and the nuts and bolts of putting together implementation of the whole program must be left in the hands of the institution because of the variety of different situations.

With that, I think I will hand it to John for a look at one approach that has been developed. I think if we could focus on that for the rest of this time, it would be well worth our while.

JOHN RHODES, GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Thank you very much Barry, and since I have no one to pass the microphone to, and the time is running short, I will get straight to the point and try to give you some idea of the work that is going on in the University System of Georgia. Hopefully, we can get some feedback and questions from all of you that will help us to improve our document, and it may help give us some additional information as to the type of guidelines that maybe should be developed for the Southern Association. To show you how fast the Vice-Chancellor for Service down here works, December 1, 1971, was the day that Standard IX went into effect and on December 5, we had an ad hoc committee to look at the implications of Standard IX--particularly the areas of the Continuing Education Unit, and the external degree started. We had nine people, seven officials, and two ex-officio with Vice-Chancellor Jordon serving as member, ex-officio member, who due to his busy schedule still took time to be at practically every one of our meetings and gave us tremendous support throughout the program and really helped us at the presidential and the chancellor's levels in getting the support and all that we needed. You can see that there were a number of people on the committee. We have several of those here today and I would just like, in order that you may know who they are should you want to question them later, for them to raise their hand where they are. You can see some of those that you may want to corner after the meeting or ask questions about. I might say before this that Dick Weigan of Georgia Institute of Technology there in Atlanta was instrumental. He was Chairman of the ad hoc subcommittee on the CEU because it did not take us too long to see that we were really dealing with two different subjects when you look at the CEU and the external degree.

The CEU, as Dean Lorey said this morning, when it was approved in the Standard and went into effect, that you can quit discussing the value of it and start determining how you are going to implement it and how you are going to use it.

We saw the CEU as obligatory but the external degree was not. We agree with Gordon Sweet's statement that the external degree part needs a lot of study; a lot more detailed study and analysis than we were able to give the CEU part of it at that time, and so we are continuing to study the external degree part.

Those others of the University System that are here that were on the committee are Hilton Bonniwell. Hilton, if you would just raise your hand. Probably a lot of you know Hilton. Fred Burgess---Fred, where are you seated? Over to the right here and then those are the only ones on the committee. However, we had a tremendous amount of help from everybody in this System. Another great asset, especially on the recording, was Lou Phillips. Lou, if you would just raise your hand,

and working with Tom Mahler and C. B. Lloyd and some of them at the Georgia Center in Athens gave us tremendous help. We also, in order to get more input from people outside the Continuing Education area and for the political strategy of getting our guidelines approved, invited a number of college presidents from throughout our system as well as academic deans, faculty members, registrars, etc. You can see the list in the booklet that we handed out earlier.

Quickly, the University System is made up of 27 institutions. We operate under one Board of Regents, and in this we have two-year colleges, junior colleges, four-year senior colleges located in both rural areas and in metropolitan areas, university-level institutions that represent medical college or engineering school, a land-grant institution, and an urban university. So, out of the 27 institutions from which we had representation, you will find many of the types of institutions that you are representing here today.

During December we tried to find out exactly what was being done in the University System. We started immediately working with the Southern Association. We also had Keith Glancy down from the National Task Force to give us some assistance and give us first hand information. I think probably one of our most productive sessions was when we met for a couple of days where we had representation from the Southern Association and representation from the National Task Force and then the members of the University System. The CEU is not something that can be taken lightly. It was something that we in the University System had to come to grips with immediately and give it some detail work and detail study. I think one of the things that we realized from the beginning is that the CEU, if it is misused, may kill the opportunity and the potential for its future use. If we do not place some quality in it, then all the potential that we see in the CEU could slip by us. I think that the members of our committee, the people in our system, the support we received from everybody we asked, saw this. It is an opportunity to record activities to bring credit where credit is due.

Quickly looking at the report -- those of you that have a copy of the report, may want to just briefly open it to the pages we have as part of the appendices, a copy of Standard IX, and then some of the forms that we are using in this section on the format and recording is going to take a considerable amount of work. I might say that this system was adopted by the 27 presidents of the institutions and by the chancellor's office on April 14, and we will start trying to implement this on July 1. We realize that we have a lot of work to do yet, but we think that we are well on the way to at least getting some historical and some experience in trying to work with the CEU.

We thought in the University System we had several alternatives. One of the alternatives is that everybody, each of the institutions, could take the Standard IX and what information they could gather and determine at their own institution how they would utilize the CEU and how they would interpret the Standard. Another alternative was

that our Central Office and Board of Regents could determine how the CEU and the Standard would be interpreted and then tell the 27 institutions. The third alternative, and the one that we tried to follow, is in line with the policies of our system. We would develop some general guidelines on the use of the Continuing Education Unit and the implementation of the Standard and then leave some flexibility in the guidelines for the individual institution. A point I would also like to make right here is that the Task Force in the Interim Statement realized the Statement set only minimum guidelines. They did not intend for the minimum statement to be the final word. We realized that we had to go further in determining the guidelines if the CEU was to be used properly. Now I think that is very important. I think it is important when we try to answer the questions that have been raised in the beginning of this document. We tried to ask all the questions, get all the questions on the table and then try to answer them. We realize that we could not, without more experience, answer those questions at this time. As Bob Pitchell said in his closing remarks, "We need additional guidelines." The utilization of the Continuing Education Unit depends on an effort to fulfill the requirements as set forth in the Standard. Now, let me just read this statement. It is on Page 3 of the document (see Appendix C).

> "The Continuing Education Unit should be used as the basic unit of measurement for an individual's participation in and an institution's offering of non-credit classes, courses, and programs."

That is a very broad statement and you could almost take that with the definition of the CEU and the other guidelines and award CEUs for everything. We thought that if that happened we would misuse the CEU and it would kill the potential that we saw in it. That is the reason that we went to the area (areas) that we tried to divide down, give some additional recommendations of criteria that should be met before the CEU was awarded.

Dean Lorey mentioned the difference between the student CEU and the institutional CEU. We talked more about the individual CEU and the institutional CEU but in Area 1 we have listed the guidelines that we think should be met.

Quickly in Area 2, we will not give individual CEUs. We will keep the information for institutional purposes and institutional CEUs, and you could read the additional criteria that we have there and in that area, but an individual transcript will not be maintained on those programs meeting the criteria in Area 2. I might say at this point, also, that one of the modifications that we will be making prior to July 1 is whether or not, and this is strictly for our system, to use the term "area" or some other term. We will be going to probably instead of Area 1, 2, and 3, to Category 1, 2, and 3. This is strictly internal in our system mainly because we have presently in our system in academic programs, Areas 1, 2, 3, and 4. We sort of thought, as pointed out by one of the presidents, there would be some confusion and

some additional work; we will be changing to the term "categories" or some other modifications.

Area 3 activities are activities that we are still providing and we think that in recording the total efforts of an institution that you have got to have various categories of programs and many of the institutions will have programs in Area 3 that should be recorded for institutional use, but they will not be programs where you would be awarding individual CEUs.

Then we realize that these three categories did not cover all of various types of programs when you try to cover the 27 institutions and try to cover junior colleges, medical colleges, land-grant institutions, and technical institutions. So we have other areas that may be identified during our first year of operation, and which we would give further consideration to at a later time. The administration of it is fairly clear in this standard.

However, one of the decisions that we did make in the University System is that our record keeping would be centralized in the Registrar's Office. In our system the registrar is the historical record keeper for the institution as far as the student's credits and that they will maintain the records on the CEU. If a person wants to write for a transcript, he will not have to write to the Continuing Education Unit and also the registrar. He can write just one place. Now I think back to the discussion of this morning, whether or not it is on one transcript or two, this is something I think could be left up entirely to the individual institution and whatever was best for that institution. I do not think we need to get that detailed, nor did we get that detailed in our document.

In recording CEUs and deciding how many CEUs would equal an FTE, we have gone to the one to one ratio. We have had discussions with Barry and Bob Day and Grover and others from the Southern Association about this, and we have figured it just like your quarter-hour programs and quarter-hour credits where 15 hours is normally a full load for a nine month academic program. Your class contact hours, approximately 15 hours a week, average quarters about 10 weeks which equals 150 hours per quarter with three quarters being an academic year. Three times 150, gives 450 contact hours, or 45 CEUs equal one full time equivalent student. I think this is still a point for discussion. We think that it should at least be on a one to one basis and, hopefully, not higher.

Uniform reporting and forms that you see in the appendix is a way of which we hope to improve the centralization of records and providing the information on the system. As I say, this is strictly for our particular system, and I think we can learn a lot from people like Dean Lorey and we hope to have him down to visit and talk with us more about it. We realize that we will need more work in this area, but I think that this does give us an opportunity to start. Our document is not a final one. I think you can see this by our outline here. We

hope to utilize it for a year and during that period of time, get additional information. We do think that it is a start. We are not going to have our feelings hurt if you criticize our document here today. I think that is what the conference is for, but I think that it does give us something that will work within our system and with our 27 institutions and, hopefully, with some criticism and discussion of it, we can improve it.

DR. GROVER ANDREWS, SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS

We will open it up to your questions because I know time is getting away and we will stay as long as you want to stay. I do have one or two things about some future plans I think you will be interested in that I will say at the end.

MR. BOB GRAHAM, STATE COUNCIL OF VIRGINIA

Grover, I believe the CEU was devised to give recognition to non-credit work that was taken, and Standard IX was revised which gave institutions flexibility, lifted the restriction on credits they could give for various instructional techniques. I have gathered from the conference here that there are going to be many complexities and difficulties in implementing this CEU. Already, there is movement to try to equate the CEU with credits and FTEs and this may be entirely necessary in places where budgets of institutions are based on FTEs, credit hours, and student faculty ratios. My question is, would it not be possible to accomplish the same thing by giving recognition for non-credit activity through the use of existing credit systems, and existing transcripts, without having to establish the whole new system which is, as I said, rather complex? I just wondered if any consideration had been given to implementation under existing systems rather than the establishment of a whole new system.

DR. GROVER ANDREWS, SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS

The answer to that question would take a report on the full work of the Task Force and the Association over a number of years. Yes, alternatives have been studied. As a matter of fact, Barry was working on trying to devise a plan when we became aware of what the Task Force was doing. I do not think we can mix as you say and apply a credit to the current credit system to non-credit activities. We would destroy the integrity of both, so to speak. In other words, what you are saying is just make all non-credit activities credit activities. Then someone would start doing non-credit activities again, you see. I do not think you can answer that.

MR. BOB GRAHAM, STATE COUNCIL OF VIRGINIA

Dean Lorey was the first one I have heard refer to the HEGIS code. I was just thinking of the possibility of giving a HEGIS code to a non-credit activity which would relate it to the credit activity under which all programs are coded now. The possibility for that non-credit seminar or whatever, is to give one quarter credit, a sixteenth of a credit or something like that. But, you would be in the fractions.

DR. GROVER ANDREWS, SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS

Right. Well, I think you are maybe looking a little too narrowly. Here again maybe most of you are used to thinking of the Southern Association as looking narrowly. Look down the road and beyond. I have noticed here at this conference that most of us cannot get out of thinking in our structured credit concept and we are not really thinking in terms of an unstructured Continuing Education Unit, and the flexibility that it can have. There will probably be a formula someday, not of translating CEUs into credit, but in lieu of credit. We have one

institution now, a new institution that is not yet a member but that is applying for membership, that is a totally external degree institution. We have had a visit with them and talked with them. They are looking at the Continuing Education Unit now as a possible measure and vehicle for taking a man who has work experience that is valuable and is organized and structured, and giving him recognition of other units in leiu of credits. Therefore saying, with this number of units and this number of credits to fill in gaps in his education, he gets a degree. He does not start as a Freshman. I talked to one of the men that they were concerned about. He has been a personnel manager for a large corporation for twelve years. He does not have a degree. He had worked his way up. He knows as much about personnel management as their college instructor. Should he start over as a freshman?

On December 1, 1971, the unit was approved and at least 603 institutions in this country in eleven states had its use decided for them.

Another question is whether or not it translates into FTEs that would be directly related to budget? It states in the Standard that the CEU records will serve as a part of the full-time equivalent student account for the institution. It does not say how it will be used. We do not think we know that right now. We are not sure in our system whether it is based on FTEs or EFTs as to whether it will ever be a part of the budget. For our discussions, especially in trying to get the guidelines through, we tried to stay away from this in talking about the budget because you are talking about scaring some college presidents. If you talk about a system like Lou described here, where they had better than a 100,000 people coming through their Center, and then you started talking about trying to figure that in EFTs and getting a budget for it, you can scare some college presidents in a hurry.

MR. ARTHUR McDANIEL, UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE

Could the last speaker go through again those figures you gave on the equivalent?

OVER ANDREWS, SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS

We have taken it to where 15 quarter hours is equal to a full time equivalent student for one quarter. Fifteen hours per quarter is a full load---that means he is in class 15 hours a week. The average quarter is 10 weeks. That is 150 contact hours per quarter. Three quarters equal an academic year and three times 150 will give you 450 contact hours, divided by your 10 CEUs (for 10 contact hours equal one CEU), will give you the 45 CEUs which equal one full time equivalent student.

DR. KEITH GLANCY, JOHN HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

I would just like to make a comment relative to the question of credit and the Task Forces viewpoint.

The basis on which we should operate as far as the Task Force is concerned is to apply c.e. units to programs which have been planned. And if and when there is a question of credit, that can be taken up by the individuals or institutions involved. It should not, at this point, be a particular consideration of the institutions putting on continuing education programs.

Now, I stress the fact that the c.e. unit should be applied after the program is planned. The idea of the Unit is not to have effect on the format or the educational objectives of that program, but only to measure what you plan to have happen. You should not be constrained in the type of Continuing Education that you offer because of the c.e. unit. It should have no effect on that with one possible exception---we hope that it will make you think a little bit more about the definition of the Unit and make sure that you do have a quality continuing education program and that possibly you have spelled out more clearly the objectives you wish to fulfill.

The c.e. unit from my point of view is a tool and a tool is something you use. It is not something that runs you around but it should be something you can make use of and that you can use to good advantage. If you cannot, it is not fulfilling its objective.

RUITH HEINEMANN, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

Last night I think I heard that a federal agency has established a division to handle the CEU. Is that correct? The Adult Education section? If so, I misunderstood, however, I would like to go on. It is my impression that Congress is considering some action to require the demonstration of competence by people involved in the delivery of health care. This brings to the attention of the health professions the need to establish some means by which their competence can be demonstrated and one of those means is participation in continuing education programs.

The American Dietetic Association has a system that has been functioning for about four years. We heard yesterday that the American Nursing Association is considering a system. I am here in several capacities and one of those is as a member of the American Society of Medical Technologists which is considering the system.

I hear from this session that, the use of the c.e. unit is particularly for the purposes of the educational institutions, which leads me to think that any way that Unit may be used would have to be through an educational institution. It would require collaboration on the part of the professional organization and the educational institution to use that CEU. So, my concern is really that the National Task Force consider the needs of professional organizations, whether it is health or engineering or law or the ministry or anything else. We need access to the CEU to demonstrate competence, for moving into academic or non-academic pursuits and for career mobility.

DR. GROVER ANDREWS, SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS

The answers to that is a flat yes. And the definition as you know as we repeat it says "under responsible sponsorship." It was not stated as institutional sponsorship or anything like that, because we definitely agree that any responsible organization could award c.e. units. Now you have certain requirements to meet to be able to do it. The professional associations can meet these requirements without any difficulty if they put their minds to it. You see, one of the obvious ones is that you have to keep permanent records. Well, a responsible national organization could do that. They have to provide instruction and direction. They can do that. There is nothing to state that a professional organization cannot award c.e. units as well as those awarded by educational institutions.

I would like to add one word to that. You will have to realize that a lot of the focus here is on the educational institution because the Southern Association deals only with institutions. Now that does not mean we are not concerned about professional organizations and business and industry, because we are and we feel that ultimately our institution can accept the units from a professional organization or a business or industry and combine these for some type of recognition to the individual. The whole concept of Standard IX, and this has been implied not only by you but others here, and the Continuing Education Unit is for the individual and not the institution or the organization.

PAUL DELKER, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Your first question of whether the Office has established a special unit to deal with the CEU is answered, "No, it has not." I did not want to give that impression if I did last night. There is of course in the Bureau of Higher Education, as there has been for many years, a unit which concerns itself with the whole question of accreditation and they will continue to have interest in the CEU. The Division of Adult Education which I represent is interested in it from the point of view in Grover's terms, of looking down the road and beyond and the unit to which I referred last night is a new unit which we have created to do that kind of planning. I am interested and our unit is interested in the CEU.

RUITH HEINEMANN, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

Thank you. Dr. Glancy, who on the National Task Force represented professional organizations?

DR. KEITH GLANCY, JOHN HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

Dr. Ball represents the American Medical Association. Frank Dickey is on the Accreditating Association. Paul Grogan is a member of SDRR, one of the engineering groups. So, we have that input from those units. Now you recognize of course that the National Task Force in its composition was not intended to be all inclusive in its representation, but general in its representation. And so we had a

small working group which by definition of being small, could not possibly include all the other elements that we might like to put in.

MR. JERRY HARGIS, CEC, VIRGINIA TECH

We have time for one more question, gentlemen.

MR. ALLEN ROAD, BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION, RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA

As over the last several years, all institutions of Higher Education have been bothered or have been required to submit HEGIS reports and I think it is 2300-8 which pertains to adult education activities. Now, I heard last week that this form had been discontinued for next year after it had been changed several years and if that is true, my next question is probably irrelevant. But if it still is in existence, how are the CEUs recording of them going to be worked into that, if at all? Now HEGIS, I think, requires a number of registrations for credit courses in non-degree credit for non-credit activities. How does CEU, if it is adopted uniformly or nationally, work into this? Or will it replace it for the non-credit activities or how? There are two questions there I guess. Is HEGIS still in operation and secondly, will this reporting form fit into it if it is?

MR. BARRY MELLINGER, SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS

We really have not taken that into consideration, as such. We were aware, of course, of HEGIS, as is the Task Force. The Task Force is trying to maintain contact with the U.S. Office (Statistical Branch) because of this problem and as you know their data on Adult Education now is coming in numbers of registrations which can vary. You will have a ratio of about one to two or 300 as relating to what one means when you have one registration. So they are watching what we are doing and we are trying to keep them informed with the expectation that if we can come out with a viable program and unit, they will adopt it for requesting data. Now the classification that they will be using, we will have to incorporate into our final guidelines. In other words, we will incorporate whatever is agreed. We may want to try to get them to modify it or we may take it. I do not know how that will work out, but we will want to have that included in the final guidelines so that it will be the same set of information that is required in two or three different places and not have to have information on completely different bases for each place to whom you have to report.

DEAN G. E. LOREY, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI, ROLLA

Could I just take a few minutes, Jerry? I have not heard that the HEGIS report is being discontinued but I think that might be fine. I am wondering what would replace it, because there would be another one. We were at Portland last year and if I recall, we did receive

at the NUEA Meeting some forms that were being put out by the Office of Education which included the Continuing Education Unit as the part of the institutional report for non-credit. Now they said they were trying to get a few institutions and then were going to go on further. We received it, I know, at Missouri. Could I just make one further comment. I would like to congratulate the Task Force and the Southern Association and Georgia's System because in looking through this, you have done a monumental task in a minimum of time and I would say that it does fit in quite closely with many of the program classifications we have in Missouri right now which are computerized. Now we could spend all day picking apart little things here and little things there and I think this is useless. I think it is a good approach; I think there is a lot that can be gained from it and I think we are getting a little bit up tight trying to blame everything in the world on the CEU. Our own internal problems are our own problems. Let us solve them and then apply the CEU to it.

JOHN RHODES, GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY

I would like to say that in our committee, Dean Lorey, we certainly took into consideration the HEGIS report and looked at this very closely. The thing that we decided as far as activity code was in Adult Education. This past issue, C. B. Lloyd has an article on their activity codes and how to classify them. That is what we have adopted and that is what you will see in our appendices. Just for the record, let me make one clarification. Standard IX was not adopted for 603 institutions, it was adopted by 603 institutions.

MR. BARRY MELLINGER, SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS

I would just like to repeat that the National Task Force started on this problem with one primary objective and a secondary objective. The primary objective was to put on record for the individual participant, his accomplishments in Continuing Education. I think we need to keep that primary objective in mind. The secondary objective is to make available data on an institutional basis and thereby make it possible to gather national data. The primary objective is still the individual participant.

MR. JERRY HARGIS, CEC, VIRGINIA TECH

Grover Andrews has some thoughts for the future.

DR. GROVER ANDREWS, SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS

Let me just say in summary, one or two things. The first thing I want to do is to introduce two more people that are here--Bob Day from our staff. Bob is Gordon Sweet's assistant. He does the research for the College Commission and then next to him is a visitor observer that we are very pleased could come--Joseph Semero--from the North Central Association of Higher Commission. A lot of you are North Central Institutions, you may want to talk to him.

We could talk a long time and I would say that we are prepared to, but I know that you have planes and cars waiting and so on. We are very pleased, speaking for the Southern Association, with this conference and with the responses that you have made and the questions you have raised --- the criticism as well as the good points because this is what we need to know.

In the next few months and the next year we will have several things taking place that you need to know now, because we are not giving you a package of answers. But we do want you to know that there are some things that are going to be coming that will help you. You helped us here yesterday and today toward those goals. One will be an interim guideline and the guideline will be as Barry described earlier---we will not give you one model and say this is it. Rather, we feel that the institution should have the opportunity and should generate the model that we in turn can react to and share with others. So the guidelines will be general but they will have specifics that will help you in answering some of your questions or at least looking at how some people have attempted to do this, such as what the Georgia System has done. I say this will be interim because we have a lot of experience to gain. One thing is taking place and we hope it will come to fruition within the next few months. Bill Turner mentioned this briefly. At the last meeting of the Task Force, we were asked if we would take the responsibility for developing the National Plan and guidelines for a National Data Bank, and we have said yes that we will. The proposal that he mentioned is the one that we have prepared and we hope that soon we can have funds to at least get this underway. We anticipate about two years of research into many of the questions that have been raised and have been articulated here, so that we can have a real base for building a national system of merit for non-credit activity for institutions, for organizations, for business and industry---all aimed at giving to the individuals that you serve, the recognition that they deserve for their continuing education activities. This is the whole purpose of it and we want to try to help facilitate it. Some of you have asked about Standard IX in general. Within the next year or two, we plan to have at least two conferences for Standard IX for interested institutions within our association. One will be for member institutions who now have programs in Continuing Education and are interested in having a fuller interpretation of the new standard. The second one will be for member institutions that do not now have any form of continuing education activity. As you noticed, we have 145 in that group. So many have said, though, in response to the study and the questionnaire, that they would like to have and that they need some guidelines. So we want to have a conference for those who want to get into it and to help them get off to the right start. I want to thank Jerry Hargis and Bill Flowers and V.P.I. for having this conference for us. We served as a co-sponsor and we wanted to do this. We had planned to do something like this and V.P.I. very generously offered to plan it, organize it, conduct it, and we thank you very much.

MR. JERRY HARGIS, CEC, VIRGINIA TECH

I want to thank all of the speakers for joining us and making our job easier. Specific thanks to Clark Jones, our Conference Staff, and most of all, to Grover Andrews for the wealth of information he supplied me in preparing this conference.

This conference proposed to provide an opportunity to examine the implications of the CEU from many viewpoints. We did not say you would agree with all of them. It was expected that the conference would raise as many questions as it answered but it was felt that the time was ripe for such a discussion. I hope that using the discussions that you have had with knowledgable individuals here, the material that you have been provided, you will be able to go home and be thoughtful about the process itself.

Again, our thanks, and if there are no further comments, the conference is adjourned.

# APPENDIX A

# GENERAL INFORMATION

# ON

# THE CONTINUING EDUCATION UNIT

Prepared by the Staff

of the

Donaldson Brown Center for Continuing Education

Blacksburg, Virginia

CONTENTS

I. Background, Rationale and Purpose of a Standard Unit

II. Definition of the Continuing Education Unit

III. Applying the CEU

IV. Record Keeping for the CEU

V. Summary Comments

# I

# BACKGROUND, RATIONALE AND PURPOSE OF A STANDARD UNIT

The need for continuous updating and other forms of self-renewal has become a concern for individuals and for employers of personnel at all levels of skill, whether publicly or privately engaged. Never before have the fruits of scientific research and disclosure promised so much to advance the material well-being of society. But never before have social structure and individual competencies been so severely threatened by the very rapidity and therefore the unevenness of the advance. This is true whether competencies are measured among individuals, companies, communities, regions, or nations. There is a great need today for the professional, the skilled worker or technician, and the general adult to be able to bring to bear a new enlightenment upon the broad social, economic and technical problems of the day.

We live in a period that requires the individual's formal education to be carried out longer, the extent of his specialization to be made sharper, and the timetable of his updating and renewal to be made ever more urgent. There has been a marked increase in the variety and

multiplicity of informal educational channels by which these tasks may be accomplished. Short courses, conferences, institutes, seminars, and correspondence study have been some of the primary non-credit or informal instructional forms created to satisfy those needs. The forms of instruction have had no uniform duration, timing, or unit of measurement, nor have they always been sharply targeted to the population.

Too little recognition is given participants --- whether students or instructors --- in continuing education experiences. Meaningful check points and career goals comparable to the established degrees and professional licenses are lacking in the variety of extension and continuing education offerings presently available to the individual.

To this point there has been no adequate means of measuring the amount of non-credit activity, except in terms of the number of persons participating in such activities, or the academic level of such activities, except to the extent that elementary, secondary or higher educational institutions may have administered the programs.

Today our nation's employers have many thousands of professional level employees and have special needs for measuring educational activities, not only for hiring purposes but also for promotional criteria.

In July of 1968, a national planning conference was called in Washington, D. C. This conference was sponsored jointly by the National University Extension Association, the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, the U. S. Civil Service Commission, the U. S. Office of Education. The purpose of their conference was to determine the level of interest the number of participating associations had in the possibilities of a uniform unit of measurement for non-credit continuing education. The thirty-four national organizations represented as the conference were known previously to have expressed an interest in one aspect or another of identifying, measuring and recognizing individual effort in continuing education.

The interest and sense of urgency for a concerted national movement expressed at this meeting resulted in the creation of a National Task Force to determine the feasibility of a uniform unit of measurement and to develop a proposal for field testing and gaining general acceptance of this concept.

The impetus for a uniform unit to measure continuing education, as mentioned above, developed as a result of the geometric increase in knowledge and the resulting decrease in the utility of learning which individuals acquire during their years of formal education. This demand for retraining activities is reflected in the constant increase in participation in continuing education and also in the number of institutions and organizations offering programs of this kind.

Several organizations and institutions have initiated or are studying a system of measurement and awards, each having little or no relationship to any other system in being. A uniform nationally accepted unit holds promise of reducing the confusion and fragmentation in arriving at a suitable means of recognizing and rewarding individual effort in the pursuit of continuing education.

These needs, and others, have resulted in the establishment of the Continuing Education Unit.

THE CONTINUING EDUCATION UNIT IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS: TEN CONTACT HOURS OF PARTICIPATION IN AN ORGANIZED CONTINUING EDUCATION EXPERIENCE UNDER RESPONSIBLE SPONSORSHIP, CAPABLE DIRECTION AND QUALIFIED INSTRUCTION.

Continuing education, for the purpose of this definition, includes all institutional and organizational learning experiences in organized formats that impart non-credit education to post-secondary level learners. These properties of continuing education may be applied equally under the proposed system regardless of the teaching-learning format, program duration, source of sponsorship, subject matter, level, audience or purpose.

The continuing education unit or CEU may be used for the measurement, recording, reporting accumulation, transfer, and rerecognition of participation by adults in programs which seldom in the past have been recorded in any formal or systematic way.

The unit can be applied with equal facility to professional continuing education, vocational retraining, and adult liberal education as well as all other programs in adult and continuing education.

The individual adult student must be able to accumulate, update, and transfer his record on continuing education throughout life as he faces a succession of hurdles with respect to maintaining or increasing proficiency in his career or in making progress toward his personal educational

goals. In the absence of such a universally recognized unit, the concept of education as a continuous process is often lost. This lack of any cumulative record results in most continuing education programs being built upon narrowly defined educational objectives and the establishment of only short-termed goals.

Thus, the purpose of the CEU is to provide a mechanism by which virtually all continuing education activities can be recorded. It is not expected, on the other hand, that all of the participation in terms of continuing education units will have utility or transferability in terms of individual programs of career development. There would appear to be definite institutional and other sponsor advantages, however, in quantifying and recording the total amount of continuing education activity for which such organizations are responsible for purposes of input-output or cost-benefit analysis regardless of whether or not the CEUs of all such activities have commercial or professional implications.

## II

## DEFINITION OF THE CONTINUING EDUCATION UNIT

Education beyond high school can be perceived as three broad and sometimes overlapping categories of education consisting of formal (credit) education, non-credit continuing education, and informal education. It is in the middle group, non-credit continuing education, with which the CEU is concerned. Units of measurement already exist for the formal segment of continuing education which is oriented toward a diploma, certificate, or degree; and informal education that is carried on outside of organized channels and without recognizable sponsorship or instruction does not lend itself to uniform measurement.

The area of informal education may well include selective and general reading, exposure to the communications media, travel, films, discussion groups, attendance at meetings, community and social activities, dialogues, exchanges of correspondence, etc.

It becomes necessary for the sponsors of continuing education opportunities to refer to their offerings in terms of continuing education units as derived from the

format, content, scope, and duration of each continuing education activity.

The continuing education unit (CEU) is defined as ten hours of participation in an organized continuing education experience under responsible sponsorship and qualified instruction or direction. Notice that course duration, responsible sponsorship, and qualified leadership all are implicit in this definition. The unit is to be neither taken nor given lightly.

This unit represents a sufficiently small amount of participation in continuing education that it will be possible for an individual to accumulate a substantial number of them over limited periods of time. The comparatively rapid pace of accumulation of units should provide essential individual incentives and motivation for purposes of fulfilling one's continuing education obligation again and again throughout a 40-year career.

At the same time, the CEU avoids direct recognition of "instructional hours" commonly associated with various formal training programs involving apprentices, the military, specific job skills, and vocationally oriented

instruction. This unit of measure compares favorably, on the other hand, with the quarter-hour of credit already established as a minimum but significant and acceptable threshold level of learning effort by a post high school student in a formal education program. Thus, the CEU should achieve early recognition among educators and the general public alike as a new unit of attractive and manageable proportions when applied to non-credit continuing education.

The CEU has the further advantage of being computed simply for all formats and durations of continuing education programming wherever contact hours or their equivalent can be determined. Included in this system are classes, lectures, workshops, seminars, symposia, institutes, short courses, etc., wherever a ready accounting may be made or organized hours of instruction or participation in a learning situation. A constructive by-product of this development may be the more nearly standard definition of the various formats in continuing education so that their respective knowledge transfers and CEU will be more consistent with one another and with activity.

Any other measure of educational content based on semesters, trimesters, quarters, etc., whether for credit or non-credit, may also be readily converted into equivalent CEU because of the decimal nature of the latter unit. This convenience makes it possible to describe any continuing education learning experience to the nearest one-tenth unit, as measured initially in contact hours.

Continuing education units may be added simply and directly in their decimal notation without the typical concern about handling common fraction or their proximate sums when working with quarters, thirds, and halves of units as is often necessary in other methods of compiling an educational record. This problem of accumulating an educational record in traditional systems is even more aggravated when transferring units between one system and another despite the fact that all have their origin in terms of class hours of participation.

There are a number of unstructed categories of continuing education: for example, independent study (known variously as home study or correspondence study), assigned reading, theses and related projects, term papers, field trips, laboratory exercises, research, report writing,

public presentations, demonstrated skills, etc. These learning experiences do not lend themselves to the direct computation of CEU in hours spent, in carrying out an assignment to the point that the new knowledge may be demonstrated by a paper, a presentation, or a report on an experiment. The actual hours of involvement per CEU in these formats might be several times that required in immediate classroom instruction. However, similar distinctions may be found in academic experience where the hours of student effort per hour applicable toward credit may vary by as much as five to one, depending upon the particular subject, the learning format, and the variable requirements imposed by the teacher.

## III

## APPLICATIONS OF THE CONTINUING EDUCATION UNIT

It should become the policy of all proponents of continuing education to encourage professional societies, certificating agencies, recruitment and placement activities, employers, personnel managers, counsellors, licensing boards, etc., to establish standards and incentives for personal and professional development. Such standards and incentives should be in terms of continuing education units to be acquired over a given period of time for particular forms of reward or recognition. It will be within the province of such organizations to establish their own requirements concerning the mix of formats, sponsors, and subject matter, as well as the overall accumulation of units within a given time frame for purposes of conferring recognition upon the individual for participation in continuing education. These organizational standards, in effect, serve the purposes of curriculum development as well as user acceptance of the sponsor, his educational offering, and the award of CEU for the particular intended purposes.

Questions regarding the precise duration, education level, and peer group judgments about the evaluation of

the unit tend to balance out in the application since each user group will apply its own standards. The test of the marketplace is one ready-made source of program evaluation. The application described is similar to the curriculum and course number sequence limitations that are applied to university credit whenever specific degree requirements are involved. Each course taken by a student is judged first by level (course number) and subject for its applicability toward a particular degree. Judgments are made whether a particular learning experience is directly applicable toward an educational goal. In the instance of the CEU, the same judgment is made by the user as to whether the learning experience is relevant to the educational goals of the individual or the need of the user.

Being open ended, the incentives make continuing education a life-long quest, both for individuals and for user groups. Each user group will establish and regulate its own requirements for the maintenance of proficiency in the particular clientele field over which it has purview or jurisdiction.

The following suggestions for the possible applications of the Continuing Education Unit are offered as guidance and to serve as illustrations. They are not to be considered inclusive or exclusive, merely illustrative.

1. Continuing education intensive courses in technical and professional areas (i.e., for engineers, lawyers, doctors, teachers, etc.)

2. In-Service training programs to improve competence in new techniques or technical areas.

3. Courses or classes which may be used in partial fulfillment or certificate or licensing requirements.

4. Programs, sponsored by technical or industrial societies through universities, which are designed to upgrade the performance of members in occupational or technical areas.

5. Liberal education programs for the general public.

6. Paraprofessional or subprofessional training programs.

7. Vocational training programs, either in-service or in-preparation for job-entry positions.

The following examples suggest the types of programs which ordinarily would not be awarded continuing education units:

1. Any program carrying academic credit, either secondary or collegiate.

2. Programs leading to high school equivalency certificates or diplomas.

3. Organizational orientation training programs.

4. Short duration programs only casually related to any specific upgrading purpose or goal.

# IV

## RECORD KEEPING FOR THE CEU

The key to the success and usefulness of the CEU will be found in its discriminating use. While the CEU is basically a quantifying mechanism, the administrative process with which it is implemented can and should provide the quality control factors to make the CEU a meaningful measurement. Administrative guidelines for the CEU process have been established by the National Task Force and are given below. It is stressed that the system of recording units of continuing education participants may be related to the current system of permanent records in use at the institution or a separate and parallel system can be designed and maintained. Reference is made again, however, to the elements found in the definition of the CEU, i.e., an organized continuing education experience; under responsible leadership; capable direction; and qualified instruction. It is further emphasized that the number of CEUs for each offering should be determined in advance through the regular channels of the administrative unit responsible for the coordination of such non-credit activities and in cooperation with the appropriate departments of the institution or organization.

These mechanics are those that are concerned with establishing and maintaining the quality control over the assignment and awarding of the CEU.

In the statement of the National Task Force on the Continuing Education Unit the administrative requirements are detailed as follows:

1. A specific high level individual within the continuing education operation of the institution should certify and approve the awarding of a specific number of Continuing Education Units for a program prior to the program offering.
2. The program director for each learning experience should be responsible for certifying that the program was attended and completed by individuals who request Units.
3. The institution is responsible for establishing and maintaining permanent records of Continuing Education Units awarded. It is suggested by the task force that the information to be recorded on each individual include at least the following:
   A. The name of the student
   B. Social Security Number of student
   C. Title of course
   D. Course description and comparative level

3. E. Starting and ending dates of activity
   F. Format of program
   G. Number of Continuing Education Units awarded

   In addition it is suggested as highly desirable that the permanent records include also:

   A. Evaluation of each individual's performance
   B. The name of the instructor and course director
   C. Personal information about the students: address, date of birth, educational background, employment, etc.
   D. Any cooperating sponsors, company, associations, agencies, institutions, governments, etc.
   E. Course classification, i.e., professional liberal education, vocational technical, job entry, in-service, etc.

It was also added by the Task Force that it would be helpful it all continuing education activities be clearly described in terms of audience, purpose, format, content, duration, teaching staff employed, course or experience pre-requisites, other qualifying requirements and levels of instruction so that intelligent judgments could be made if the transfer process of the CEU was instituted.

Although it is obvious that the actual mechanical process used for implementing the CEU will vary from institution, it might prove helpful to think in general terms about the process. It would appear that there are three basic steps in the CEU process which will apply no matter what individual variations will be found. They are: The DETERMINATION step, the ACTUATION Step, and the REPORTING Step.

Within the DETERMINATION Step the institution would:

1. Decide (by the person assigned that responsibility) if the CEU is appropriate for the particular program in question. It is suggested that the CEU will not be appropriate for each and every program within the institution.
2. Work out the details of the level and type (or format) of the program. This is to be done in conjunction with the instructor or academic representative and the sponsoring agency or organization.
3. Determine the number of CEUs to be awarded.

At this point the ACTUATION Step begins. The first formalized activity in this step may be the announcement of the CEU availability in the program announcement. The second step is for the participants to actually "sign-up"

for the CEU as they enroll for the program. The third step is when (at the completion of the program) the program director certifies that the individual participants did indeed have the required number of contact hours to justify the awarding of the CEU.

The final step, the REPORTING of the CEU is activated at such times as the individual records are posted on the participants "transcript" of the CEUs.

## V

## SUMMARY COMMENTS

It is anticipated that the CEU will go through a process of development and refinement as its use becomes more widespread. Already we find that the Southern Association of Schools and Colleges has modified its Standard Nine accreditation policy to include the use of the CEU as a measurement for non-credit activity, and the Universities and Colleges in its eleven-state region are under administrative mandate to use the CEU. It is highly likely that, as this experience grows, other accrediting agencies will move toward the CEU concept.

There are many benefits of the CEU process which are not enumerated here, and those individuals involved with the CEU, (The Southern Association, the National Task Force, NUEA, and others) are more than happy to share their experiences and insights into this process with other individuals and institutions.

It is obvious that in this day of rapid and massive change, the average individual must continue to learn if he is to remain an effective, efficiently functioning human resource. Those of us in the business of providing

educational opportunities to the busy adult must now realize that it is just as obvious that we must provide the adult with a way he can measure and accumulate and be recognized for the wide range of non-credit learning experiences available to him. The CEU provides a way to do just that.

# APPENDIX B

# QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

# ABOUT THE

# CONTINUING EDUCATION UNIT

Prepared by the Staff

of the

Donaldson Brown Center for Continuing Education

Blacksburg, Virginia

## RECOGNITION OF THE CEU

Q. WHAT HAS BEEN THE GENERAL ACCEPTANCE OF THE CEU CONCEPT ACROSS THE COUNTRY?

A. Though relatively new, the concept of the CEU seems to find almost universal acceptance. The questions with the CEU are not with the concept but, in general, the mechanics of implementation.

Q. ARE ANY OTHER REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS FOLLOWING THE SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION'S LEAD IN RECOGNIZING THE CEU?

A. Other associations have discussed the CEU, but at that point, none have formalized it into their accreditation standards.

Q. WILL THE USE OF THE CEU BE COMPULSORY?

A. For those institutions within the eleven-state southeastern region serviced by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, the use of the CEU is compulsory for the reporting of non-credit activities.

Q. WILL THE USE OF THE CEU BE LEFT TO THE DISGRESSION OF THE INSTITUTION?

A. Use of the CEU concerning the appropriateness of any given educational experience for the awarding of the CEU is indeed a decision made by the institution or organization. However, as mentioned above, use of the CEU is compulsory for those universities and colleges within the Southern Association's eleven-state southeastern region.

Q. DOES IT APPEAR THAT ANY FEDERAL AGENCY, I.E. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION, LABOR, U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION, ETC., WILL OFFICIALLY RECOGNIZE OR ADOPT THE CEU FOR TRAINING RECORDS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES OR IN PLACEMENT SERVICES FOR NON-GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES?

A. It is perhaps too early to answer definitely this question but it appears that from the level of interest expressed by the Civil Service Commission, the CEU may well be implemented into some governmental training activities.

Q. WILL THE CEU BE APPLICABLE TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND THEIR RESPECTIVE EMPLOYEES?

A. The CEU concept and its implementation is applicable to any continuing education activity for adults that meets the criteria and standards specified by the National Task Force on the CEU.

Q. WHAT HAS BEEN THE RESULT OF THE TESTING USE OF THE CEU AND PILOT INSTITUTIONS?

A. The National Task Force, in cooperation with the Conference and Institute Division of the National University Extension Association, conducted with the assistance of fourteen universities a pilot project in the 1970-71 school year. The results of this project were reported by the National University Extension Association and report indicated that no serious administrative problems were noted. The one major problem in the pilot project was that of determining individual attendance and, thus, determining which individuals could legitimately be awarded the CEUs. In summary, the pilot project report stated the CEU met with general acceptance which can be considered a significant accomplishment since it was applied by people and to people who had a limited opportunity to understand and evaluate the concept.

Q. HOW WILL WE MAINTAIN QUALITY - PREFERABLY UNIFORM QUALITY - IN PROGRAMS THROUGHOUT THE COUNTRY, PARTICULARLY WHEN IT REQUIRES SEVERAL UNITS TO EARN A CERTIFICATE OR OTHER DOCUMENTATION OF A STUDENT'S HAVING REACHED A CERTAIN PLATEAU?

A. The administrative processes suggested by the National Task Force on the Continuing Education Unit help insure a qualification of the CEU when applied with disgression. It is anticipated that as experience for the use of the CEU grows, it will be much easier to maintain uniform quality of the types of learning experiences for which the CEU is granted.

Q. ARE CERTIFICATES AWARDED AT COMPLETION OF CEU AND BY WHOM?

A. Each individual institution must make its own determination as to whether the awarding of certificates recognizing accumulated CEUs is to be done at the conclusion of each learning experience or whether a transcript for the student is to be maintained. It is anticipated that there will be a wide variety of responses to this particular idea.

Q. HOW CAN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS USE THE CEU?

A. The CEU can be extremely helpful to professional organizations in their in-service training programs or for purposes of accreditation. Many professional organizations in various states are now requiring a certain amount of continuing education activity each year to maintain certification in the organization. The CEU would provide a convenient unit of measure for this purpose.

Q. WILL THE CEU BE APPLICABLE TO THE UNIVERSITY WITHOUT WALLS PLAN?

A. While the implications of the question are not completely clear, it is difficult to imagine the CEU being granted for independent study, assigned readings, theses, or related projects such as term papers, field trips, laboratory exercises, etc. These learning experiences do not lend themselves to the direct computation of CEUs, in hours spent in carrying out an assignment to the point that new knowledge may be demonstrated by a paper, a presentation, or a report on an experiment.

Q. WILL THE CEU BE APPLICABLE TO ESTABLISHING EQUIVALENCY OR TO TRANSFER FOR CREDIT EARNING COURSE WORK IN AN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION?

A. It is, of course, impossible to say what any institution may do in a particular situation, but it should be emphasized (and this the Task Force has specifically stated) that the CEU is not a system of academic credits to be accumulated toward a degree or some initial certification.

Q. ARE ANY COLLEGES WHO ARE ALREADY USING THE CEU GRANTING COLLEGE CREDIT FOR CEUs EARNED?

A. No.

## STANDARDS AND QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE CEU

Q. SHOULD CEUs BE AWARDED FOR REGULAR CREDIT COURSES IF THIS WORK WILL BE COMBINED WITH NON-CREDIT WORK FOR A CERTIFICATE FOR EXTERNAL DEGREE?

A. At the present time, it is suggested that the CEU is appropriate only for non-credit activity. If an institution chooses to award a certificate or an external degree based upon its own requirements and blending of credit and CEU non-credit activity, that of course would be up to the institution.

Q. WHAT ARE THE MAXIMUM OR MINIMUM STANDARDS REQUIRED OF A PROGRAM FOR THE AWARDING OF THE CEU?

A. The administrative requirements for determining the appropriateness of the CEU for a given program are listed in the guidelines of the Task's Force Interim Statement. A copy of this is available in the handout, General Information on the CEU, which was provided at this conference

Q. WILL CONTINUING EDUCATION RETAIN ITS FLEXIBILITY BY IMPLEMENTING CEU PROGRAMS?

A. There is no reason why continuing education should not be able to increase its flexibility by offering yet another area of service in the awarding of the CEUs which enable participants to accumulate and then eventually report their non-credit learning activities.

Q. WHAT ARE THE SITUATIONS WHERE CREDIT COURSES MAY ALSO CARRY CEU CREDIT?

A. None at this time.

Q. ARE CEUs RECORDED ON A REGULAR STUDENT'S TRANSCRIPT?

A. The system of recording the CEU is left entirely to the university or institution within certain bounds. It has been suggested that addition to current record keeping systems or parallel systems be developed for the recording and reporting of the CEUs.

Q. HOW MAY CEU CREDIT BE DETERMINED FOR INDEPENDENT STUDY EFFORTS?

A. At this time it does not appear that independent study is an appropriate methodology for the awarding of CEUs. However, these questions are still under discussion.

Q. WHO CAN AWARD CEUs? INSTITUTIONS AFFILIATED WITH THE SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION ONLY, OR ADULT LEARNING CENTERS, OR WHAT?

A. Those institutions, organizations, or associations which meet the requirements of the CEU definitions for administrative policies and procedures may award the CEU if they choose to adopt this particular system.

Q. MAY CEUs BE GIVEN TO PERSONS AUDITING A CREDIT COURSE IN THE REGULAR CURRICULUM?

A. This would have to be at the determination of the institution involved.

Q. ARE THERE SPECIFIC OFFERINGS WHICH WOULD BE INAPPROPRIATE FOR THE AWARDING OF THE CEUs?

A. It is suggested that there are. Examples of these are listed in the handout, "General Information on the CEU," which was provided as a part of the conference material.

Q. WE HAVE BEEN TEACHING CERTAIN COURSES ON NON-CREDIT BASIS FOR THE LAST TWO YEARS. MAY WE NOW GIVE CEUs FOR THESE COURSES RETROACTIVELY?

A. No. Determination of CEU awards must be made prior to the presentation of the non-credit learning activity.

Q. CAN A CEU BE AWARDED WHEN AN EMPLOYER REQUIRED THAT WORK BE TAKEN AND THE EMPLOYER PAYS THE BILL?

A. The conditions under which the program of non-credit is undertaken, have no bearing on the awarding of the CEU. If the program has been advertised for one in which the CEU will be awarded, the individual who successfully completes it and meets the requirements of the program will receive the CEU regardless of how his participation in the program was financed.

Q. WHAT ARE THE FACTORS THAT DETERMINE DESIGNATION OF A COURSE AS A CONTINUING EDUCATION UNIT COURSE?

A. The administrative requirements suggested by the National Task force on the Continuing Education Unit are enumerated in the handout, "General Information on the CEU," which was provided as a part of your conference material.

Q. WILL ALL NON-CREDIT WORK NEED TO BE RECOGNIZED EVEN IF SPECIFIC COURSES ARE NOT RECOGNIZED AT A GIVEN POINT IN TIME FOR A SPECIFIC GOAL? IT IS LIKELY THAT AT A FUTURE POINT STUDENTS WOULD NEED TO SHOW PROOF OF THEIR HAVING PURSUED A GIVEN SUBJECT TO A SPECIFIC DEGREE.

A. The individual institution will determine what courses are appropriate for awarding of the CEU. Whether they wish to accumulate CEU records on all non-credit activities or not is still to be determined and it is questionable whether a student who does not request the CEU at the time of enrollment could be granted that CEU after the fact.

Q. WHAT ARE THE ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS FOR IMPLEMENTING THE CEU AND WHAT DIFFICULTIES HAVE INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION HAD INITIATING THE CEU THUS FAR?

A. The pilot project report was referred to in Section 1 of this question and answer booklet, and the administrative requirements are highlighted in the "General Information on the CEU" handout that was provided as a part of your conference material.

## COSTS FOR THE CEU

Q. HAVE ANY COST'S STUDIES FOR CEU AS COMPARED TO CREDIT PROGRAMS BEEN DONE AND IS THIS DATA AVAILABLE?

A. The editors of this booklet were unable to find any data of this type.

Q. IS THE CEU GOING TO INCREASE ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS?

A. Probably.

Q. IS THERE ANY POSSIBILITY FOR OBTAINING FEDERAL AND FOUNDATION FUNDING FOR CEU?

A. If you mean to assist an institution in maintaining CEU records, the answer is probably no.

## RECORD KEEPING FOR THE CEU

Q. CAN CEUs BE CONVERTED TO FTEs?

A. Depending on the individual institution's agreed definition of FTEs, the CEUs could indeed be an indication of FTEs for non-credit activity.

Q. CAN A SYSTEM BE DEVELOPED TO COMPUTE FTEs AND RECORD THEM AS A PART OF THE OFFICIAL RECORDS OF THE INSTITUTION?

A. This certainly should be possible.

Q. WILL CEU DATA BE COLLECTED AT REGISTRATION OR COMPLETION OF THE COURSE?

A. It depends on the specific process adopted by the individual institution?

Q. WHEN AND WHERE WILL THE NATIONAL BANK BE ESTABLISHED FOR THE ACCUMULATION AND RECORDING OF THE CEU?

A. Though such has been under discussion by the National Task Force for some time, no definite site or system has been determined as yet.

Q. WHAT MAXIMUM DATA MUST BE MAINTAINED FOR PERMANENT CEU RECORDS?

A. The data that has been suggested by the National Task Force is listed in the "General Information Booklet on the CEU" which was provided as a part of your conference material.

Q. WILL THERE BE A NATIONAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE TO PROMOTE, IMPLEMENT, AND EVALUATE THE PROGRESS AND USE OF THE CEU?

A. Such a committee has been in existence for four years. It is entitled the National Task Force on the Continuing Education Unit and is chaired by Dr. William Turner of North Carolina.

Q. ARE CEUs SIMPLY ACCUMULATED LIKE GOLD STARS?

A. In a sense you could say they are. However, the qualification and quantification measurements and standards that are imposed make them much more meaningful.

Q. WHAT RECORD KEEPING MUST I EMPLOY FOR MY NON-CREDIT COURSES TO SATISFY THE SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION?

A. The revision of Standard IX which identifies the use of the CEU as a measurement standard for non-credit activities by the Southern Association is extremely flexible in its approach. It states that each member institution involved in these special activities will provide appropriate organizational structure and administrative processes according to the magnitude of its program. Specific questions should be directed to the Executive Secretary of the Commission, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 795 Peachtree Street NE, Atlanta, Georgia 30308.

Q. TO WHAT EXTENT SHOULD CEUs BE USED FOR REPORTING PROGRAM VOLUME?

A. This is a determination that must be made by the individual institution. However, the definition and administrative standards of the CEU should be taken into account when awarding CEUs for non-credit learning experiences.

Q. WITHIN A TYPICAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE WHO SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR MAINTAINING THE PERMANENT RECORDS OF CE UNITS EARNED?

A. Within the Southern Association the responsibility has been given to that administrative unit responsible for the non-credit activities. It may, of course, be worked cooperatively with the individual institutions already existing admissions and record keeping systems.

Q. HOW WILL THE BOOKKEEPING SYSTEM BE ORGANIZED FOR NATION-WIDE APPLICATION OR USE OF THE CEU?

A. This is still to be determined.

Q. WHO WILL ACCOUNT FOR AND MAINTAIN RECORDS FOR THE CEU?

A. The administrative unit responsible for the non-credit learning activities will be responsible for maintaining CEU records in any given institution.

Q. HOW ARE RECORDS TO BE KEPT TO ASSURE MOBILE STUDENTS OF TRANSFER OF THEIR ACCUMULATED CREDITS FROM ONE UNIVERSITY TO ANOTHER?

A. The record systems may be different from university to university. The format and administrative requirements of the CEU are the same as described by the National Task Force. Therefore, institutions implementing the CEU process and following the administrative structures suggested by the National Task Force will be assured of compatible reporting systems.

Q. IS THERE A PROJECTION FOR ~~A~~ CENTRAL BANK OF CEUs OR AT LEAST A REGIONAL CENTER WHICH CAN RECORD AND RETRIEVE RECORDS WHICH ARE SURE TO BE VOLUMINOUS?

A. As already indicated above, there are in progress discussions with various organizations nationally to establish a National Bank for the CEUs.

## MISCELLANEOUS

Q. WHAT CONSTITUTES AN ORGANIZED CONTINUING EDUCATION EXPERIENCE?

A. The Interim Statement of the National Task Force on the CEU defines an organized continuing education experience as follows:

> "Continuing Education for the purpose of this definition includes all institutional and organizational learning experiences in organized formats that impart non-credit education to post secondary level learners. These properties of continuing education may be applied equally under the proposed system regardless of the teaching-learning format, program duration, source of sponsorship, subject matter, level, audience, or purpose.

Q. WHAT CONSTITUTES SATISFACTORY PARTICIPATION?

A. This is a question still open to broad interpretation.

Q. WHAT IMPACTS IN THE WAY OF CHANGES TO CONTINUING EDUCATION AS WE GENERALLY KNOW IT TODAY IS THE INTRODUCTION OF THE CEU LIKELY TO PRODUCE?

A. One of the most immediate would be to make the non-credit learning experiences that have been offered cafeteria style over the past much more useful to the adult participant in the sense that it can now be recorded and recognized in a specific manner.

Q. PLEASE CLARIFY BASIC PURPOSES OF THE CEU ONCE AGAIN.

A. The Interim Statement of the National Task Force on the Continuing Education Unit states the purpose and objective of the CEU as follows:

> The Continuing Education Unit may be used for the measurement, recording, reporting, accumulation, transfer and recognition of participation by adults and programs which seldom in the past have been recorded in any formal or systematic way. A unit can be applied with equal facility to professional continuing education, vocational retraining, and adult liberal education as well as all other programs in adult and continuing education. The purpose of the unit is to provide a mechanism by which virtually all continuing education activities can be recorded.

# APPENDIX C

# A WORKING PAPER ON THE CONTINUING EDUCATION UNIT:

# ONE MODEL ON THE USE AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CEU WITHIN A UNIVERSITY SYSTEM

Presented by the College Commission of the

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools

At The

VPI Conference On The CEU

April 27-28, 1972

One of the major purposes of the conference is for the College Commission of the Southern Association to gather feedback information from representatives of member institutions on the continuing education unit. The c.e.u.,as was developed by the National Task Force of the National University Extension Association,was incorporated into the newly revised Standard Nine - Special Activities (non-traditional studies) which was adopted by the College Delegate Assembly in December of 1971.

The intent of the College Commission in including the c.e.u. in Standard Nine is two fold: one, as a record-keeping measure for all non-credit activities of an institution and of the individual student; and two, the c.e.u. records will serve as a part of the full-time equivalent student account for the institution.

Some of the questions that have been raised and which will need to be answered are as follows:

1. How can the c.e.u. be implemented in a University System? What are the alternatives?

2. Is there a demand for the recording of c.e.u. participation?

3. How will the c.e.u. be used in determining faculty work loads? Will faculty be programmed for "X" number of c.e.u.'s each quarter?

4. Will the c.e.u. be utilized in faculty promotions? How?

5. If the c.e.u. refers to a student unit or a student credit hour of attendance, how many of these will make a Public Service Student FTE?

6. To what extent should c.e.u.'s be used for reporting program volume?

7. What are the problems relating to record-keeping involved in registration, accumulation of credits, official transcripts and reports of c.e.u.'s?

8. What groups or organizations outside of academia will be using or awarding the c.e.u.?

9. What constitutes "an organized continuing education experience?"

10. What are the criteria used to determine which organized continuing education experiences will receive c.e.u.'s? How many c.e.u.'s?

11. What is the demand for the c.e.u. and how will participants benefit from this credit?

12. Is there a method or reason for controlling the number of c.e.u.'s a participant may acquire in a specified period of time?

13. What determines if a person has already been awarded c.e.u.'s for a similar or identical experience either at your institution or another institution?

14. What constitutes satisfactory participation?

15. Can the c.e.u. be used as a measure of quality in service programs?

16. Can c.e.u.'s be converted to academic credit for use toward a degree?

17. Under what conditions and by what procedures should c.e.u.'s be converted to academic credit for use toward a degree?

18. Can c.e.u.'s be converted to FTE's for the purpose of fund allocations?

19. Should there be levels and categories regarding the structuring of the c.e.u. data system? (Example: undergraduate - business - management)

20. How will the c.e.u. be used or become a part of the total data collection for public service activities?

21. Should class cancellations and actual contact time be rigidly considered and measured for c.e.u.'s--absence, etc.?

Shortly after the newly revised Standard Nine was adopted, the University System of Georgia appointed an ad hoc committee to study the implication for the system of the new standard and the c.e.u. The work of this committee spanning about four months came to a conclusion on April 14, 1972, with the adoption of a plan of utilization and implementation of the c.e.u. for the Georgia system.

Members of the College Commission staff met with and gave assistance to this committee as the Georgia plan of implementation was developed. This plan is presented here for use at the VPI Conference as a model of one approach to an effective and meaningful use of the continuing education unit.

Out of this plan and the information gathered at this conference will come a handbook of guidelines and suggested models to assist the member institutions of the College Commission of the Southern Association in developing their own plans for use and implementation of the c.e.u.

Included in this paper are:


1. The Georgia Plan - pages 1-6
2. Standard Nine - pages 9-14
3. Report Forms - pages 17-24


The Commission on Colleges will be glad to receive any suggestions pertaining to the development of the handbook of guidelines on the c.e.u. Please send your suggestions in writing to:


Grover Andrews
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
795 Peachtree Street N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

# The Use of The Continuing Education Unit to Report Special Activities in the Institutions of The University System of Georgia

An Interim Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Continuing Education Unit

"One Continuing Education Unit is
TEN CONTACT HOURS OF PARTICIPATION
in an Organized Continuing Education Experience
Under Responsible Sponsorship, Capable Direction
and Qualified Instruction."

(P. 21 from Standard IX of the Standards of the College Delegate Assembly of Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, December 1, 1971.)

April 14, 1972

AD HOC COMMITTEE OF THE PUBLIC SERVICES COMMITTEE

OF THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA*

Chairman, John A. Rhodes, Jr., Georgia State University

Vice Chairman, H. T. Bonniwell, Georgia Southern College

J. Fred Burgess, Columbus College

David B. Kelley, Gainesville Junior College

T. W. Mahler, University of Georgia

George W. Shelton, Chairman, Business Division, Albany Junior College

Richard Wiegand, Georgia Institue of Technology

Howard Jordan, Jr., Vice Chancellor for Services, ex officio

B. R. Tilley, Chairman, Public Services Committee and President, Albany Junior College, ex officio

* The Ad Hoc Committee was given the responsibility to study the implications of both the continuing education unit and the external degree section of the Revised Standard Nine of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. This report is dealing only with the continuing education unit and was approved by the presidents of the twenty-seven system institutions on April 14, 1972, to be effective July 1, 1972. The Ad Hoc Committee will continue to work on the report to make appropriate implementation plans.

## ADVISORY PANEL

Richard Barbe, Dean
Graduate Studies
School of Education
Georgia State University

Millard L. Blakey
Manpower Development Specialist
Rural Development Center

W. Wray Buchanan
Director of Services
College of Business Administration
University of Georgia

Glenn Garrison, Chairman
Department of Community Medicine
Medical College of Georgia

Charles L. Hayes, President
Albany State College

Richard Hodges
Associate Registrar
Georgia State University

Lloyd L. Joyner, Jr.
Registrar
Georgia Southern College

J. J. Lancaster
Professor and Head
Extension Education Department
Cooperative Extension Service

Leon Lessinger
Callaway Professor of Education
Georgia State University

C. B. Lord, Associate Director
Georgia Center for Continuing Education
University of Georgia

Douglas Meyers
Director of Continuing Education
Middle Georgia College

Starr Miller, Dean
School of Education
Georgia Southern College

William S. Patrick
Dean of Admissions and Registrar and Acting Vice President for Administration
Georgia State University

Darl E. Snyder
Acting Director
Rural Development Center

John W. Teel
President
Brunswick Junior College

## CEU AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE

Hilton T. Bonniwell
Georgia Southern College

David B. Kelley
Gainesville Junior College

Richard Wiegand, Chairman
Georgia Institute of Technology

# INTRODUCTION

The commitment of the University System of Georgia to public service and continuing education was well expressed by the Board of Regents when it adopted a policy statement on public service in 1971. Noting the growth of the System to twenty-seven institutions, the statement points out:

> As this growth has taken place, Continuing Education and Public Service have emerged as an extension of the traditional on-campus learning process, available to adults wherever sufficient interest has been found. Individuals in all walks of life must keep themselves abreast of new knowledge and understand how it can be applied effectively in solving the many problems which they and their communities are encountering. Any system designed to achieve these objectives will be built around an aggressive continuing education program.

The statement recognizes the wide variety of programs of public service and continuing education that are now in progress throughout the University System. In its concluding paragraph, the statement acknowledges the responsibility of the University System to provide "not only the best possible educational experiences for young people, but also opportunities for continuing education for adults in all walks of life."

One problem that has been faced in continuing education and public service programs throughout the years has been the necessity for a system's allowing the orderly recognition and reporting process for the non-credit learning efforts of the individual and the programming efforts of institutions. The Commission on Colleges and Schools now requires its member institutions, if they engage in certain special activities, to recongize and record properly the institution's efforts.

This action took place in December, 1971, when the College Delegate Assembly adopted a new "Standard Nine," a series of regulations that requires new procedures and policies at every member institution engaged in "Special Activities" (a term used by the Southern Association to

denote such public service activities as continuing education, off-campus extension, conference and institute work, etc.). Standard Nine became effective upon its adoption and is now in effect and obligatory upon all member institutions engaged in special activities. ( A copy of Standard Nine is in Appendix I.)

An ad hoc subcommittee of the membership from the Public Service Committee of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia was appointed by its chairman to study the implications of the area of Standard Nine requiring that "non-credit programs should be appropriately identified and recorded by means of the continuing education unit (c.e.u.)." It is the purpose of the following interim report to examine the ramifications of the use of the continuing education unit by the University System of Georgia and to recommend appropriate actions.

## DEFINITION

The authors of Standard Nine drew heavily upon work that had been proceeding for several years by the National Task Force to Study the Feasibility and Implementation of a Uniform Unit for the Measurement of Non-Credit Continuing Education Programs. The National Task Force states that "one continuing education unit is ten contact hours of participation in an organized continuing education experience under responsible sponsorship, capable direction and qualified instruction." Standard Nine incorporates this unit and its definition as the measuring device which is to be used to construct a system for reporting an institution's non-credit special activities program efforts.

## POSSIBLE METHODS OF IMPLEMENTATION

There are several ways that the c.e.u.'s for non-credit special activities can be implemented at institutions in the University System of Georgia. Three approaches discussed by the subcommittee were as follows:

1. Each institution in the System could develop its own implementation policies and procedures for the recording of c.e.u.'s.

2. The University System could develop and administer both policies and procedures for the c.e.u. The System could handle from its Atlanta offices (under the direction of the office of the Vice Chancellor for Services) every report function.

3. The University System could develop (through its committee structure) broad, general policies on the c.e.u. and its use in public service programs and continuing education at System institutions. Such system-wide committees could make major definition decisions, establish guidelines and criteria, and make decisions concerning such matters as information required on records and reports. Other decisions (such as which programs would be granted c.e.u.'s) could be handled at the local institutional level.

The subcommittee recommends the third approach, since it is consistent with the University System's heritage and practice concerning institutional autonomy for local programming. The third approach also allows for the required uniformity in records and reports which must go from the University System institutions to the Regents and to the Southern Association.

Utilization of the Continuing Education Unit

The following statement appears in Standard Nine:

> The continuing education unit should be used as the basic unit of measurement for an individual's participation in and an institution's offering of non-credit classes, courses, and programs.

In order to fulfill the above statement of measuring an individual's participation in and an institution's total offering of non-credit special activity programs, the ad hoc subcommittee recommends that the continuing education unit be used in three areas of special activity programs in all units of the University System of Georgia

AREA I

Activities classified in this category will meet at least the following standards:

1. The non-credit activity is planned in response to an assessment of educational need for a specific target population.

2. There is a statement of objectives and rationale.

3. Content is selected and is organized in a sequential manner.

4. There is evidence of pre-planning which includes the opportunity for input by a representative of the target group to be served, the faculty area having content expertise, and continuing education personnel.

5. The activity is instructional and is sponsored by an academic or administrative unit of the institution best qualified to affect the quality of the program content and to select and approve the resource personnel utilized.

6. There is a provision for registration for individual participants.

7. Evaluation procedures are utilized.

Individuals who participate in Area I activities will register and have individual records of their involvement submitted to and be available from the institution registrar. Continuing education units will be assigned in advance to programs and awarded to individual participants.

AREA II

Activities classified in this category will meet at least the following standards:

1. The activity is a planned educational experience of a continuing education nature for a diversified population.

2. The activity is instructional in nature and is sponsored by an academic or administrative unit of the institution best qualified to affect the quality of the program content and to select and approve the resource personnel utilized.

3. Registration is required but only to produce a listing of the participants for institutional reporting use.

Individuals who participate in Area II activities will register, but no c.e.u.'s will be awarded and no individual transcript of their involvement will be available. Institutional certification of involvement will be made by means of a registration list, and a file of program materials will be maintained by the public service or continuing education officer.

AREA III

Activities classified in this area will meet at least the following standards:

1. The activity is a planned educational event with a stated purpose and is open to the general public.

2. It is sponsored by an academic or administrative unit of the institution.

3. Certification of total attendance is required.

These events exclude entertainment-type activities, although they are open to the general public. For reporting purposes each institution will certify an attendance figure, but the institution will not have to register each individual attending. No individual c.e.u.'s will be awarded.

OTHER AREAS

Each institution may wish to classify and report other activities of a non-credit nature to illustrate those things which require staff effort but do not meet the standards of the above three areas. Until further experience provides the needed information to articulate the area standards for these activities, it is suggested that institutions report these activities not in terms of c.e.u.'s but only on the basis of total attendance and that no c.e.u. credits be given.

Administration

The role and function of the chief administrator for special activities is to determine in advance through designated administrative channels the appropriate c.e.u. area in which to classify the activity and to specify the number of c.e.u.'s which may be awarded.

The Standard requires that the administrative policies, procedures, and services appropriate to conduct the non-credit special activities should be developed and administered by the public services vice president, dean, or director in cooperation with other administrators and policy groups. The registrar's office will service these activities by developing for the special activities unit mechanisms for maintaining permanent records of an individual's involvement in Area I activities. His office will also maintain program materials

on these activities for possible reference, just as he now maintains a file of college catalogs, class rolls, etc. He should be prepared to issue upon request an accumulative c.e.u. record for each individual who has ever participated in Area I activities at the institution.

Information Required and Reporting Methods

In an effort to collect basic data about all non-credit activities and to provide for uniform reporting throughout the University System, the ad hoc subcommittee recommends that the procedures and forms outlined in Appendix II be followed.

Standard Nine also requires that the c.e.u. records serve as a part of the full-time equivalent student account of non-credit special activities for the institution. After conferring with officials of the Southern Association, the subcommittee determined that, for the purpose of counting the volume of non-credit special activities, forty-five continuing education units are equal to an equivalent full-time student for a nine-month academic year. Fifteen continuing education units are equal to an equivalent full-time student for the Summer Quarter. These conversions should be made, and the resulting figures will be the full-time equivalent student account for the institution.

Reporting Dates

Public service activities within the University System do not adhere to an academic quarterly break but generally operate on a continuing nature. However, statistical summaries can be computed and reported for those activities completed during this time frame. The ending date of an activity will determine the month in which it is to be reported.

January, February and March activities will be reported in April.

April, May and June activities will be reported in July.

July, August and September activities will be reported in October.

October, November and December activities will be reported in January.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Standard Nine became effective as of its adoption by the Delegate Assembly of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools in December, 1971. However, it is felt that final procedures for implementing the continuing education unit cannot be developed without some experience in the use of the unit. Therefore, the following time schedule is recommended:

| | |
|---|---|
| July 1, 1972 | All System institutions begin recording c.e.u.'s for FY '73 using criteria and collecting essential data on all activities. |
| February 15, 1973 | The October and January continuing education reports will be reviewed by the ad hoc committee and further recommendations made to System institutions. |
| September 1, 1973 | Final Report due on Guidelines for implementation of the c.e.u. in the University System. |

It is further recommended that the suggestions outlined in this report relative to the use of the c.e.u. be adopted by all units within the System. A uniform procedure must be followed if the System is to gain the insight needed to finalize policies and procedures for the c.e.u.

Also, it is further recommended that the subcommittee on the continuing education unit work on both formal and informal bases with the public service directors and directors of continuing education of units throughout the University System. The subcommittee can also serve as a source of information for campus registrars and other interested officials. In addition, subcommittee members could work with the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Services if necessary.

# APPENDICES

# APPENDIX I

# STANDARD NINE

## Special Activities

Many institutions have developed a variety of supplemental and special educational programs in fulfilling their stated objectives, their public and community service demands, and their responsibilities to their constituents. Special activities programs are defined as: operationally separate units, external or special degree programs, off-campus classes and units, independent study programs including correspondence and home study, conferences and institutes including short courses and workshops, foreign travel and study, media instruction including radio and television, and on-campus programs including special summer sessions and special evening classes.

An institution inaugurating, continuing, or expanding special activities programs should have resources available beyond those provided for the basic academic programs of the institution. Since the quality and excellence of all instructional programs should be of constant concern to every institution, it is essential that the provisions for special activities should include an adequate administrative organization, a sound financial base, a competent faculty, and sufficient and adequate facilities for the program offered.

The Commission does not wish to be restrictive on new special activities programs of a member institution but rather seeks to encourage innovation and an imaginative approach to providing quality instruction according to the educational needs of the college's constituents. An institution contemplating the inauguration of a new special activity not covered by this standard shall inform the Executive Secretary of the Commission in advance as to the nature, design, and purpose of the new program area. An institution may solicit an advisory opinion of the Executive Secretary of the Commission as to the appropriateness of a contemplated new activity.

Unless specifically qualified in the Illustrations, credit regulations for the special activities programs should be consonant with those of the total institution. The amount of credit for each course or program should be determined in advance through the regular channels of the administrative unit for special activities in cooperation with the appropriate deans and departments of the institution. Non-credit programs should be appropriately identified and recorded by means of the continuing education unit (c.e.u.).

On-campus programs of a special activities nature, whether designated as continuing education or as adult and extension activities, should be coordinated within the organizational structure of the institution relative to special activities; they should be governed by the policy guidelines of the institution.

The Standards of the College Delegate Assembly apply directly to all programs. It shall be the responsibility of the parent institution to justify all special activities (credit or non-credit) within the framework of its stated purpose and objectives as a function of its central mission. All special activities programs must be compatible with the total educational program of the institution.

Special activities shall always be evaluated and judged by the Commission on Colleges as part of its function in recommending the granting or reaffirming of accreditation of the total institution.

Illustrations and Interpretations

1. Administration and Organization

Each member institution involved in special activities will provide appropriate organizational structure and administrative processes according to the magnitude of its program. These must be well-defined and should be clearly understood by the total institution. Institutional organization should recognize and provide a separate identity (a clearly identifiable and defined administrative unit) for special activities under the direction of a designated administrative officer (e.g., vice chancellor, vice president, dean, director, or coordinator). All policies and regulations affecting special activities should be formulated by the administrative officer in conjunction with and as a part of campus-wide administrative and academic advisory groups.

The administrative unit for special activities shall be responsible for coordination of all special activities within the institution, both on and off campus.

Procedures within the institution for the establishment of new programs, interinstitutional agreements and arrangements, and resources allocation should recognize special activities as an integral part of the total institution. The administrative unit should provide for continuous systematic evaluation of programs and offerings within the total scope of special activities.

The continuing education unit should be used as the basic instrument of measurement for an individual's participation in and an institution's offering of non-credit classes, courses, and programs. A c.e.u. is defined as ten contact hours of participation in an organized continuing education (adult or extension) experience under responsible sponsorship, capable direction, and qualified instruction. Information and guidelines on c.e.u. may be obtained by writing to the Executive Secretary of the Commission. The c.e.u. records will serve as a part of the full-time equivalent student account for the institution.

2. Financial

The administrative unit for special activities should operate under a clearly identified budget on a fiscal year basis. The budget should be prepared and administered (internal management and accounting) by the designated officer of the unit in conformity with the fiscal policies and procedures of the central business office of the institution. Institutional or general fund support for special activities should be consistent with institutional policy for support of all divisions or units within the total institution.

Special activities should not be determined solely on the principle of being "self-supporting" but rather on the principle of fulfilling the educational responsibility of the institution to its constituents. Necessary financial resources must be available and committed to support the special activities of the institution.

3. Faculty

Provision of an adequate and qualified faculty and staff to support the special activities program is essential to maintaining the academic quality of the institution. Full-time faculty and staff members in special activities should be accorded the same recognition and benefits as other faculty and staff members of the institution.

All who teach in special activities must have competence in the fields in which they teach, attested to by advanced study culminating in appropriate graduate degrees; or by extensive work experience in the teaching fields; or in a professional practice which is of the highest quality.

Policies governing the amount of teaching allowed, overloads, and compensation for full-time faculty members from other units of the institution assigned to special activities programs should be developed and approved jointly by the administrative head of the special activities unit and the appropriate administrative and academic personnel of the institution.

### 4. Students

It should be recognized by the total institution that the nature and characteristics of the typical special activities student is somewhat different from that of the regular full-time college or university student. The special activities student is usually older, career oriented, and engaged in a full-time job. Student development services should be provided and be developed cooperatively by the administrative unit for special activities with other appropriate units of the institution.

Policies should be developed for admissions, registration procedures, counseling and guidance services, and records. The characteristics of these policies should be directly related to the nature, character, and need of the special activities student.

### 5. Operationally Separate Units

An operationally separate unit off-campus is a degree-granting division or unit of an institution, located in a geographical setting separated from the parent institution or central administration and authorized for a stated purpose in relation to the parent institution and the area served. It has planned programs leading to undergraduate, graduate, or professional degrees which are granted by or in the name of the parent institution or central administration.

A degree-granting unit shall have such administrative organization, programs, financial resources, library, and physical facilities that it can be evaluated as an autonomous institution in terms of the Standards of the College Delegate Assembly. It must follow regular procedures for membership in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. When the unit achieves accreditation, it will be listed as any other institution in the membership.

### 6. External or Special Degree Programs (Non-Traditional Study)

An external or special degree program comprises a course of study different from the traditional undergraduate degree which may or may not require on-campus study or residence and which relies almost entirely on independent study and examination. An institution inaugurating, continuing, or expanding an external or special degree program should develop specific policies and guidelines which include admission policies with special attention to the age and maturity of the individual to his prior educational achievement and vocational and avocational experiences and to his goals and objectives. Guidelines concerning transfer of credit, credit by examination (e.g., College Level Examination Program of the College Entrance Examination Board and the institution's own examinations) and residency requirements (periodic seminars and special sessions), if any, need to be established. Methods of evaluating a student's progress, including advising and counseling, should be explicit. Evaluation and examination procedures to determine that the individual has successfully completed the degree requirements must be clearly outlined and fully developed.

An institution contemplating the inauguration of an external or special degree program should inform the Executive Secretary of the Commission in advance and arrange for a preliminary advisory study by the Commission prior to undertaking the program.

### 7. Off-Campus Classes and Units

Courses taught in an off-campus setting should maintain the academic integrity of the institution. Special attention should be given to insure the appropriateness of the courses to the students. Courses requiring laboratories, extended library study, or other special materials should not be offered unless arrangements are made to provide the necessary resources.

When an off-campus program in a particular locality grows to the extent that the institution is offering a comprehensive academic program to a specific student body, then the institution should consider the establishment of a special off-campus unit such as a center or regional campus. The parent institution should provide an organization for full-time administration of the unit, for faculty, for library staff, and for physical facilities, that are comparable to their campus counterparts.

***These programs and the amount of credit or c.e.u.'s for each should be determined in advance through the regular channels of the administrative unit for special activities in cooperation with the appropriate deans and departments of the institution.***

### 8. Independent Study

Independent study programs including correspondence courses basically fall into one of two categories. One type is the formalized independent study course or program which may lead to a degree. Academic standards in such programs and courses shall be consistent with standards in on-campus classes and may require such formal requirements as written reports, examinations, and on-campus conferences with faculty.

A second type of independent study is that which relates to the study which a person may do on his own and for which he may seek credit from the institution by examination, such as the CLEP.

***These programs and the amount of credit or c.e.u.'s for each should be determined in advance through the regular channels of the administrative unit for special activities in cooperation with the appropriate deans and departments of the institution.***

### 9. Conferences and Institutes

Conferences and institutes and their many variations are an important part of the special activities programs of many institutions. For purposes of identification and clarification the following categories and definitions may be useful:

**Conference:** A general type of meeting usually of one or more days' duration, attended by a fairly large number of people. A conference will have a central theme but is often loosely structured to cover a wide range of topics. The emphasis is on prepared presentations by authoritative speakers, although division into small group sessions for discussion purposes is often a related activity.

**Institute:** Generally similar to a conference, but more tightly structured to provide a more systematic development of its theme, with the emphasis more on providing instruction in principles and techniques than on general information. Participants are usually individuals who already have some competence in the field of interest. Institute programs may have certain continuity, meeting on a yearly basis for example.

**Short Course:** A sequential offering, as a rule under a single instructor, meeting on a regular basis for a stipulated number of class sessions over a short period of time (e.g., one to three weeks, etc.). Quizzes and examinations may be given depending upon the determination of requirements. The non-credit course under the Public Service definition may resemble the credit course in everything but the awarding of credit. It may also be more informal and more flexible in its approach in order to meet the needs of students.

**Workshop:** Usually meets for a continuous period of time over a period of one or more days. The distinguishing feature of the workshop is that it combines instruction with laboratory or experiential activity for the participants. The emphasis is more likely to be on skill training than on general principles.

**Seminar:** A small grouping of people with the primary emphasis on discussion under a leader or resource person or persons. In continuing higher education a seminar is more likely to be a one-time offering, although it may continue for several days.

**Special Training Program:** A skill program which offers a combination of instruction and practice. The approach is usually on a more individualized basis than a workshop.

***These programs and the amount of credit or c.e.u.'s for each should be determined in advance through the regular channels of the administrative unit for special activities in cooperation with the appropriate deans and departments of the institution.***

### 10. Media Instruction

Media instruction includes any form of instruction offered in special activities through television, radio, computer assisted instruction (CAI), telewriter, tele-lecture and other such forms of media instruction which may develop.

***These programs and the amount of credit or c.e.u.'s for each should be determined in advance through the regular channels of the administrative unit for special activities in cooperation with the appropriate deans and departments of the institution.***

### 11. Foreign Travel and Study

Credit shall not be permitted for travel **per se**. Degree credit shall be granted only for residence or travel abroad involving an academic program supplemented by seminars, reading, reports, or similar academic exercises based on the same criteria for credit as independent study. Special attention should be directed to the quality of the academic programs at the foreign institution or institutions.

*These programs and the amount of credit or c.e.u.'s for each should be determined in advance through the regular channels of the administrative unit for special activities in cooperation with the appropriate deans and departments of the institution.*

### 12. On-Campus Programs

Many of the special activities of an institution are conducted on campus. Such programs include evening classes and special summer sessions which are not a part of the regular schedule and curriculum of the institution and other types of programs which are conducted on campus in continuing education, adult, and extension activities (e.g., conferences, institutes, short courses, workshops, seminars, and special training programs).

*These programs and the amount of credit or c.e.u.'s for each should be determined in advance through the regular channels of the administrative unit for special activities in cooperation with the appropriate deans and departments of the institution.*

# APPENDIX II

## PARTICIPANT SUMMARY REPORT

| | | Area I | Area II |
|---|---|---|---|
| I. | Total number of registrations | _____ | _____ |
| | A. Sex | | |
| | 1. female | _____ | |
| | 2. male | _____ | |
| | B. Age classification | | |
| | 1. under 22 | _____ | |
| | 2. 22–35 | _____ | |
| | 3. 36–55 | _____ | |
| | 4. over 55 | _____ | |
| | 5. information not given | _____ | |
| | C. Minority participation | | |
| | 1. American Negroes | _____ | |
| | 2. Spanish-surnamed Americans | _____ | |
| | 3. American Indians | _____ | |
| | D. Non-minority participation | _____ | |
| II. | Total participants in Area III activities | | _____ |
| III. | Total participants in Areas I, II and III | | _____ |

IV. Registrations by states

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alabama | ___ | Louisiana | ___ | North Dakota | ___ |
| Alaska | ___ | Maine | ___ | Ohio | ___ |
| Arkansas | ___ | Maryland | ___ | Oklahoma | ___ |
| Arizona | ___ | Massachusetts | ___ | Oregon | ___ |
| California | ___ | Michigan | ___ | Pennsylvania | ___ |
| Colorado | ___ | Minnesota | ___ | Rhode Island | ___ |
| Connecticut | ___ | Mississippi | ___ | South Carolina | ___ |
| Delaware | ___ | Missouri | ___ | South Dakota | ___ |
| Florida | ___ | Montana | ___ | Tennessee | ___ |
| Georgia | ___ | Nebraska | ___ | Texas | ___ |
| Hawaii | ___ | Nevada | ___ | Utah | ___ |
| Illinois | ___ | New Hampshire | ___ | Vermont | ___ |
| Idaho | ___ | New Mexico | ___ | Virginia | ___ |
| Indiana | ___ | New Jersey | ___ | Washington | ___ |
| Iowa | ___ | New York | ___ | West Virginia | ___ |
| Kansas | ___ | North Carolina | ___ | Wisconsin | ___ |
| Kentucky | ___ | | | Wyoming | ___ |

V Registrations by Georgia counties

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Appling | ___ | Evans | ___ | Newton | ___ |
| Atkinson | ___ | Fannin | ___ | Oconee | ___ |
| Bacon | ___ | Fayette | ___ | Oglethorpe | ___ |
| Baker | ___ | Floyd | ___ | Paulding | ___ |
| Baldwin | ___ | Forsyth | ___ | Peach | ___ |
| Banks | ___ | Franklin | ___ | Pickens | ___ |
| Barrow | ___ | Fulton | ___ | Pierce | ___ |
| Bartow | ___ | Gilmer | ___ | Pike | ___ |
| Ben Hill | ___ | Glascock | ___ | Polk | ___ |
| Berrien | ___ | Glynn | ___ | Pulaski | ___ |
| Bibb | ___ | Gordon | ___ | Putnam | ___ |
| Bleckley | ___ | Grady | ___ | Quitman | ___ |
| Brantley | ___ | Greene | ___ | Rabun | ___ |
| Brooks | ___ | Gwinnett | ___ | Randolph | ___ |
| Bryan | ___ | Habersham | ___ | Richmond | ___ |
| Bulloch | ___ | Hall | ___ | Rockdale | ___ |
| Burke | ___ | Hancock | ___ | Schley | ___ |
| Butts | ___ | Haralson | ___ | Screven | ___ |
| Calhoun | ___ | Harris | ___ | Seminole | ___ |
| Camden | ___ | Hart | ___ | Spalding | ___ |
| Candler | ___ | Heard | ___ | Stephens | ___ |
| Carroll | ___ | Henry | ___ | Stewart | ___ |
| Catoosa | ___ | Houston | ___ | Sumter | ___ |
| Charlton | ___ | Irwin | ___ | Talbot | ___ |
| Chatham | ___ | Jackson | ___ | Taliaferro | ___ |
| Chattahoochee | ___ | Jasper | ___ | Tattnall | ___ |
| Chattooga | ___ | Jeff Davis | ___ | Taylor | ___ |
| Cherokee | ___ | Jefferson | ___ | Telfair | ___ |
| Clarke | ___ | Jenkins | ___ | Terrell | ___ |
| Clay | ___ | Johnson | ___ | Thomas | ___ |
| Clayton | ___ | Jones | ___ | Tift | ___ |
| Clinch | ___ | Lamar | ___ | Toombs | ___ |
| Cobb | ___ | Lanier | ___ | Towns | ___ |
| Coffee | ___ | Laurens | ___ | Treutlen | ___ |
| Colquitt | ___ | Lee | ___ | Troup | ___ |
| Columbia | ___ | Liberty | ___ | Turner | ___ |
| Cook | ___ | Lincoln | ___ | Twiggs | ___ |
| Coweta | ___ | Long | ___ | Union | ___ |
| Crawford | ___ | Lowndes | ___ | Upson | ___ |
| Crisp | ___ | Lumpkin | ___ | Walker | ___ |
| Dade | ___ | McDuffie | ___ | Walton | ___ |
| Dawson | ___ | McIntosh | ___ | Ware | ___ |
| Decatur | ___ | Macon | ___ | Warren | ___ |
| DeKalb | ___ | Madison | ___ | Washington | ___ |
| Dodge | ___ | Marion | ___ | Wayne | ___ |
| Dooly | ___ | Meriwether | ___ | Webster | ___ |
| Dougherty | ___ | Miller | ___ | Wheeler | ___ |
| Douglas | ___ | Mitchell | ___ | White | ___ |
| Early | ___ | Monroe | ___ | Whitfield | ___ |
| Echols | ___ | Montgomery | ___ | Wilcox | ___ |
| Effingham | ___ | Morgan | ___ | Wilkes | ___ |
| Elbert | ___ | Murray | ___ | Wilkinson | ___ |
| Emanuel | ___ | Muscogee | ___ | Worth | ___ |
| | | | | TOTAL | |

## QUARTERLY PROGRAM SUMMARY REPORT

I. Information required for Quarterly Program Summary Report

A. Number of programs in ascending numerical order.

B. Activity code number––Each program shall be categorized by a three digit numbering system utilizing the following classification system. For reporting purposes programs should be grouped by activity code in sequential order.

1. Problems and issues of society in . . .
   - 1.01 Health and safety
   - 1.02 Human relations and communications
   - 1.03 Education
   - 1.04 Government
   - 1.05 Business
   - 1.06 Law and law enforcement
   - 1.07 Community development
   - 1.08 Aging
   - 1.09 Social change
   - 1.10 Environment
   - 1.11 Agriculture and food production

2. Subjects of personal interest . . .
   - 2.01 Leisure time activities
   - 2.20 Cultural enrichment
   - 2.03 Expanding knowledge about the world and its people
   - 2.04 Civic and economic understanding

3. Skills and/or Knowledge for occupational improvement in . . .
   - 3.01 The professions
   - 3.02 Business and industry
   - 3.03 Government
   - 3.04 Education
   - 3.05 Law and law enforcement
   - 3.06 Clerical
   - 3.07 Trades and technologies
   - 3.08 Agriculture and food production
   - 3.09 Social services

4. Subjects Related to intellectual skills development in . . .
   - 4.01 Reading
   - 4.02 Writing
   - 4.03 Language
   - 4.04 Mathematics
   - 4.05 Critical and creative thinking
   - 4.06 Listening

5. Subjects related to personal life problems and demands . . .
   - 5.01 Finance
   - 5.02 Foods and nutrition
   - 5.03 Family living
   - 5.04 Child development
   - 5.05 Health and safety
   - 5.06 Personal assessment
   - 5.07 Consumer understanding

C. Program classification code

1. Area I
2. Area II
3. Area III

D. Format code

1. Conference
2. Institute
3. Short course
4. Workshop
5. Seminar
6. Special training program
7. Other

E. Title (limited to 36 spaces)

F. Program location

G. Length of program in hours

H. C.e.u.'s that may be earned in activity participation (for Area I activities only)

I. **Instructional hours:** Cumulative hours of all faculty in contact with participants. This would accommodate the use of panels, team teaching and concurrent sessions where more than one faculty is in contact with students at the same time

J. Total participants (excluding instructional staff)

K. **Participant hours:** Cumulative total of hours participants are in instructional sessions.

L. C.e.u. total (for Area I activities only)

## QUARTERLY PROGRAM SUMMARY REPORT

Institution _____

Reporting period _____

Summary Date _____

Page _____ of _____

| No. | Activity Code | Area | Format | Program Title | Location (city) | Activity | | | Participants | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | Length | c.e.u. | Instr. hours | Registered | Part. hours | c.e.u. awarded |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Totals | | | | | | |

## QUARTERLY PROGRAM SUMMARY REPORT BY ACTIVITY

Institution_____ Summary Date_____

Reporting period _____ Page _____ of _____

| Activity Code | Total Programs | Total Registrations | Total Participant Hours | Total CEU Awarded |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Totals | | | | |

# QUARTERLY FACULTY PARTICIPATION REPORT

| | Number | Instructional Hours |
|---|---|---|
| **I. Faculty Status** | | |
| 1. Instructor | _____ | _____ |
| 2. Assistant Professor | _____ | _____ |
| 3. Associate Professor | _____ | _____ |
| 4. Professor | _____ | _____ |
| 5. Graduate assistant or Graduate student | _____ | _____ |
| 6. Other Institutional Personnel | _____ | _____ |
| 7. Other | _____ | _____ |
| TOTALS | _____ | _____ |
| **II. Institutional Affiliation** | | |
| 1. Reporting institution | _____ | _____ |
| 2. University System institution | _____ | _____ |
| 3. Georgia institution other than University System | _____ | _____ |
| 4. Out-of-state institution of higher education | _____ | _____ |
| 5. Out-of-country institution of higher education | _____ | _____ |
| 6. Other | _____ | _____ |
| TOTALS | _____ | _____ |

## DATA REQUIRED FOR INSTITUTIONAL RECORDS

**Participant Information**

I. Information to be maintained on all individuals participating in Area I and II activities are as follows:

A. Social security number

B. Name of individual participant

C. Sex

D. Address (street, city, state)

E. Age classification code

1. under 22
2. 22–35
3. 36–55
4. over 55

II. Information required on all individuals participating in Area I activities only is as follows:

A. Title of activity

B. Activity format code

1. conference
2. institute
3. short course
4. workshop
5. seminar
6. special training program
7. other

C. Brief course description

D. Starting and ending dates of activity

F. Location of activity

G. Number of c.e.u.'s earned

ERIC Clearinghouse
APR 24 1973
on Adult Education

This information will be kept on permanent record and transcripts will be furnished by the registrar upon individual request. Institutions may desire to obtain more detailed information, but the above information is the required basic data.